


SCS #1208

3.
680

Thomas F. Torrey

SCS #1208



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<https://archive.org/details/pentecostalgift00scot>

Scottish Church Society Publications.

SCOTTISH CHURCH SOCIETY CON-
FERENCES. First Series. J. Gardner Hitt, Edin.

THE DIVINE LIFE IN THE CHURCH.
An affirmation of the Doctrines of Holy Baptism ;
With Contributions relating to the Scottish Church,
her History, Work, and Present Need. Scottish
Church Society Conferences. Second Series. In
2 vols. J. Gardner Hitt, Edin.

MACLEOD LECTURES.

Blackwood, Edin.

DR. JOHN MACLEOD : His Work and Teaching.
By A. Wallace Williamson, D.D.

SCHISM. By G. W. Sprott, D.D.

KYRIE ELEISON : A Manual of Private
Prayer (3rd Edn.). By H. J. Wotherspoon, M.A.
Blackwood, Edin.

THE DIVINE SERVICE : A Eucharistic
Office. By H. J. Wotherspoon, M.A.
MacLehose, Glasgow.

SCOTTISH CHURCH SOCIETY
CONFERENCES

THIRD SERIES

PUBLISHED BY
JAMES MACLEHOSE AND SONS, GLASGOW,
Publishers to the University.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.
New York, - - The Macmillan Co.
London, - - - Simpkin, Hamilton and Co.
Cambridge, - - Macmillan and Bowes.
Edinburgh, - - Douglas and Foulis.

MCMIII.

THE PENTECOSTAL GIFT

Scottish Church Society

“Ask for the Old Paths . . . and walk therein”

GLASGOW
JAMES MACLEHOSE AND SONS
PUBLISHERS TO THE UNIVERSITY

1903

GLASGOW : PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
BY ROBERT MACLEHOSE AND CO.

PREFACE.

THE following Papers were contributed at the Fifth Conference of the Scottish Church Society, held at Perth in June 1902.

A statement of the objects of the Society, in connection with which these Papers (relating to matters obviously of high importance to the life of the Church) are now published, will be found in the Appendix to this volume.

To the longer Papers contributed to the Conference thirty minutes' time was allowed for delivery ; to the shorter, twenty. This limitation accounts for the brevity with which some of the subjects are treated.

The Papers, after revision, are printed substantially in the form in which they were read.

Each author is responsible only for the contents of his own paper.

Other papers, certainly not less worthy of publication, were read at the Conference—by the Rev. Theodore Marshall, D.D.; Rev. C. M. Grant, D.D.; Rev. A. Wallace Williamson, D.D.; Rev. James Greig, Rev. Andrew Millar, Rev. James Brunton,

Rev. George Milligan, Rev. Duncan MacGregor, Rev. C. S. Christie, Rev. J. M. Campbell, Rev. J. Cromarty Smith, P. M'Gregor Chalmers, Esq.; George Wilkie, Esq.; D. M. M. Milligan, Esq.—which for various reasons are not included. The papers here given are included as bearing on a single subject.

In view of the evidences which exist of deepening interest in those aspects of theology which concern the Doctrine of the Third Person of the Ever-blessed Trinity, and His Mission in the Church, the editorial committee venture to hope that the Papers printed in this volume may be serviceable to the faith of those who desire a consistent apprehension of “the Divine basis, supernatural life, and heavenly calling of the Church.”

May, 1903.

CONTENTS.

Opening Address.

Rev. A. WALLACE WILLIAMSON, D.D., one of the
Ministers of S. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh, - - - I

I. The Relation of the Incarnation and the Redemptive Acts of Our Lord to the Pentecostal Gift, of which He is Mediator.

Rev. MICHAEL P. JOHNSTONE, B.D., Fraserburgh, - 13

Rev. A. W. WOTHERSPOON, M.A., Oatlands, Glasgow, 21

II. The Pentecostal Gift to the Church as distinguished from the work of the Spirit of God towards Humanity at large.

Rev. A. STUART MARTIN, B.D., Scone, - - - 35

Rev. J. M. KIRKPATRICK, B.D., S. Bride's, Partick, - 44

III. The Relation of the Pentecostal Gift to the Opera- tions of Grace, through the Ordinances of the Lord in the Church, and the relative Experience of the Soul.

Rev. ROGER S. KIRKPATRICK, B.D., Govan, - - - 52

Rev. GEORGE BELL, M.A., Mus.D., S. Kenneth's,
Govan, - - - - - 59

IV. The Relation of the Pentecostal Gift to the Ordinance of the Word :

The Holy Scriptures the Oracles of God committed to the Church.

Rev. S. J. RAMSAY SIBBALD, B.D., Crathie, - - - 65

The Church's Stewardship of the Holy Scriptures.

Rev. H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A., Edinburgh, - - - 74

V. The Spiritual Conditions of Effective Preaching in the Ministry and in the Flock.

Rev. J. R. M'CALLUM, B.D., Larkhall, - - - 82

VI. The Pentecostal Gift in relation to Prayer as a Divine Activity :

In Corporate Ministry.

Rev. H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A., S. Oswald's, Edinburgh, - - - - - 93

In the Personal Communion of the Soul with God.

Rev. S. MARCUS DILL, M.A., Alloway, - - - - 102

X VII. The Pentecostal Gift in relation to the Sacraments :

Their Efficacy an Efficacy of Christ through the Holy Spirit. - - - - - 111

Baptism : The Grace Given and Improved. - - - 122

Holy Communion : The Presence Vouchsafed ; and our Preparation, Celebration, and Reception.

Rev. H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A., S. Oswald's, Edinburgh, - - - - - 140

VIII. The Pentecostal Gift in relation to the Ministries :

The Ascended Lord, on Whose shoulder is the Government, and His Constant Relation to the Ministries of His Institution.

Rev. Professor COOPER, D.D., Glasgow, - - - 161

The Consequent Perpetuity of the Ministries, and the necessity of a valid Ordination thereto.

Rev. S. J. RAMSAY SIBBALD, B.D., Crathie, - - 170

IX. Ordination :

As in Holy Scripture, and in the Post-Apostolic Age.

Rev. Professor COOPER, D.D., Glasgow, - - - 177

Doctrine and Practice of Reformation and the Reformed Churches.

Rev. GEORGE W. SPROTT, D.D., N. Berwick, - - 192

Recent Doctrine and Practice.

Very Rev. THOMAS LEISHMAN, D.D., Linton, - - 209

X. The Pentecostal Gift in relation to Rule, Obedience, and Concord in the Church.

Rev. H. MONCRIEFF MACGILL, Northesk, - - - 217

Rev. JAMES LANDRETH, M.A., Logie-Pert, - - 224

XI. Hindrances to the Present Operation of the Holy Spirit in the Church : A Call to Revived Faith, Penitence, and Prayer.

Rev. Professor COOPER, D.D., Glasgow, - - - 230

APPENDIX, - - - - - 244



OPENING ADDRESS.

REV. A. WALLACE WILLIAMSON, D.D.

THE duty has been laid upon me of saying a few words at the opening of our Conference, to explain the purpose for which it is met. It has been our custom since this Society was formed, now ten years ago, to hold a Conference once in every two years. And in pursuance of that policy we have visited the four University cities in their turn—Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and St. Andrews. Before we had completed our visit to these important centres, a proposal came up in the General Assembly for the institution of a biennial Church Congress. That proposal has been adopted and carried out—first in Glasgow, and last year in Aberdeen—with a considerable measure of success. At each of these Congresses there was a large attendance of the public, and the discussions which took place were of great interest, and must have done much to stimulate the life and thought of the Church. In view of this new departure on the part of the General Assembly, and also of the fact that we had completed the circuit of the University towns, it was felt that there was not the same necessity for our smaller Conference,

and our meetings have not therefore been continued at the same regular intervals. On the other hand, it was strongly felt by many that a smaller Church Conference, such as we had been accustomed to hold, might still fulfil a useful practical purpose. There are many aspects of Christian life and duty on which it is of the highest importance that members and ministers of the Church should take counsel together, but which we instinctively feel should not be dealt with in a large, and, it may be, mixed assembly. This is obviously true in regard to the topic which is to engage our attention in the present Conference, viz., the Pentecostal Gift in its relation to the Church and the Individual Soul. That is plainly a subject of the deepest and most vital importance. It is not in the ordinary sense popular. It will hardly draw large audiences. And yet there is no subject within the whole range of present-day discussion which more keenly concerns the real life of the Church, and there is no problem vexing the Church or the world to-day which would not be easier of solution if we were able to approach it with a clear conception of the mission of the Holy Ghost, and a humble submission to that Spirit of Truth Who, as our Lord assures us, is to guide us into all truth. For such reasons we feel that there still remains for us a useful and a helpful work to do in this Conference.

But there may be some who are perplexed as to our name and our purpose. There may be some who will say: "The Church we know, and the Scottish Church we know, but who and what is the Scottish Church Society?" There were some who asked

that question ten years ago, and who answered it in their own way by denying our right to exist within the Church, and calling out for our immediate suppression. We were subjected to a great deal of criticism. Of some of that criticism we had no right to complain, for there may surely be honest difference of opinion among Churchmen. But there were other forms of criticism which we distinctly repudiated. It was said, for instance, that there was no call for the existence of such societies within the Church, that the Church courts were the proper places for the discussion of all legitimate subjects. I do not know what insinuation was implied in the use of the word *legitimate*, but I have observed since that some of those who raised the objection were among the first to suggest and support the institution of a Church Congress. And this was to a certain extent an admission of the justice of our position. For though I wish to speak with the utmost respect of our Church courts, I think I may, without exaggeration, say that there are many legitimate subjects of great importance in Church life which demand consideration, and which cannot satisfactorily be dealt with there. In so saying I do not wish to depreciate the system of Church government under which we live, and which contains elements at this moment the admiration and envy of our sister Church in the south. But I do not think I can be accused of being disrespectful, nor will careful students of the reports of Church courts disagree with me, when I say that the discussions which take place there sometimes lead to a condition of—let us say temperature, if not

temper—which is not conducive to the calm treatment of more spiritual and religious themes. And there is also another reason. For these courts are essentially judicial bodies concerned with the discipline of the Church. And they can only really deal with matters of doctrine or worship when these arise in a judicial way. There is, therefore, we believe, ample room and justification for the existence of such a Society as this, provided always its aims are legitimate.

Now I do not propose, in explaining the aims of this Society, to take up an attitude of apology. I wish simply to say that our name is the true index to our nature. We are what we call ourselves—a *Scottish Church Society*—a Society whose central aim is to realise in ourselves and to revive in others the true idea of the Church in our land as a branch of that Society founded by Jesus Christ, and having its birth at Pentecost. We desire to keep each side of our title in its true place. We are Churchmen, and we are Scottish Churchmen; and we desire to claim for ourselves our rightful heritage under each of those names.

Now, it will at once occur to you that if this be our central aim it is one on which all loyal members of the Scottish Church should be agreed. I have never held any other opinion, and I hold no other opinion now. When I joined this Society I believed, as I believe now, that its aim is to maintain and defend the great principles on which the Church of Scotland, in common with every true branch of the Church of Christ, is founded; and because I believe that, I continue to be a member

of this Society. For I am convinced that it has a true and real mission to fulfil. We do not, as a society, accept responsibility for everything that is said or done by any individual member. There are shades of opinion among us, just as there are in the Church generally. And I should be sorry indeed (while claiming to be loyal to the Church of Scotland and admitting the loyalty of others) to accept responsibility for everything that anyone may say or do in her name. But that does not prevent me from recognising their right nor from claiming my own. What the Church is to be judged by is her real purpose as expressed in her constitution and enforced by the general character of her teaching and action. And so of this Society—its purpose, as I have said, is to defend and maintain the reality of the Church's mission as a divine institution. We lay emphasis upon this, because, although the aims of the Society are worked out in detail, into twenty-two different articles, this is the cardinal point of all. And in taking up this position we believe that we are not only loyal to the fundamental principles of the Scottish Church, but that we are calling attention to a truth which in many quarters is, at least, much neglected at the present time. The divine calling and character of the Church as an institution of the ascended Lord is not a truth which we can ever admit to be the possession of a section or the badge of a party. It is the spiritual heritage of all. But there are many parts of our spiritual heritage into which we fail fully to enter. And this, we believe, is one of them. We are proud, and justly proud, of the history of our

Church, and that it still maintains its national testimony. But we are not always and equally alive to the divine reality of its mission, to its supernatural origin and destiny, to the fact that God, and not man, has called it and placed it here as His witness through word and sacrament to the people of this land. We rejoice that amid all our differences there has been, and still is, a large measure of practical acceptance of this truth. But we need a deeper, fuller, more universal, and, may I add, more spiritual and whole-hearted adhesion to the living Body of which Christ is the living Head. We need to realise, as we are not sufficiently doing, that the Church is not merely an organisation using human means and human agencies, but that it is in a high and special sense the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit of God called on earth to fulfil His work.

One has sometimes heard the remark that we are having "too much Church," and apparently in some quarters "Churchiness" is regarded as a thing that calls for condemnation. I am not disposed to quarrel with the saying. For if by "Churchiness" is meant a form of opinion, or practice, which puts Christ aside, then I say it is to be condemned and rejected for ever. If it means a form of teaching which merely exalts the ministry and leads them to "lord it over God's heritage," and forget their true position, as described by St. Paul, "ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake," then let it be condemned and rejected, as it must be in loyalty to Christ. But that is no true doctrine of the Church which separates between her and Christ. And that is no true ministry which forgets—"whosoever will be

chief among you, let him be your servant." The way to escape from this danger is not to run into another. A false Churchism can only be met by a true Churchmanship. And that consists in passing beyond all "isms" to the unity of all believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, to the great doctrine of the one Church of God, of which there is only one King, and one Head.

I am the more confirmed in saying this, and saying it strongly, because in the principles of our Scottish Reformers there is nothing more clear and definite. Indeed, it would seem that one main secret of their strength lay in the fact that with all the energy of their denunciation of the corruptions in the doctrine and practice of Rome, there was joined a firm and unhesitating grasp of the divine reality of the Church as the Body of Christ. They did not meet the errors of the day with mere negations. They met them with a living and positive message. They believed that to the Visible Catholic Church had been given by Christ the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of the New Testament. And the crown of their message was the testimony of a living Church purified in life and doctrine, strong in her faith in God's presence, and assured of the spiritual efficacy through Him of her teaching and sacraments. It is the same living faith in the mission of the Church which we believe to be the great and vital want of our time. And there are several ways in which we are confident it would tell for good.

(1) It would give to the ministry a higher sense of their divine calling. I do not mean, as I have

already said, that it would lead them to magnify their office or to glorify themselves. The danger of such a result is greatest when the true relation of Christ to the Church is obscured. When the consciousness of that relation is clear it becomes a living and practical power in our ministry. And there is a very special reason for emphasising it at the present time. At this moment, as for some years past, we find ourselves face to face with a very serious problem in the great dearth of candidates for the holy ministry. For this, no doubt, there are many secondary reasons, but I am certain that one main reason is the obscuring and lowering of the idea of the Church as the true Body of Christ, which has been too common among us. There can be no real attractive power to any earnest man in some of the views of the Church which are from time to time put forward. If it be a mere human institution groping about for a creed, and uncertain as to its own foundation, there is little ground for wonder that men are slow in rallying to its service. But, on the other hand, let its true character and aims be set before men; let them realise that the Church is a real divine institution on earth, that the ministry is a divine calling, that the Lord Jesus Christ confers upon those who give themselves to His work a real commission, then, and not till then, will you touch the right men and gain the right response. And in taking this ground we know that we are in absolute harmony with the highest and best traditions of our own Scottish Reformers. They believed, as Dr. Sprott has shown in his recent learned lecture on Schism, they "believed in one Catholic Visible

Church, the spouse of Christ, the Body of which He is Head, a supernatural kingdom of which He is Lord: and they regarded national Churches as provinces of this kingdom." And because they so believed, they regarded the ministry as a sacred office to which no one had a lawful calling who had not been duly ordained. To them the Church was not a shapeless mass, but a divine organisation for administering grace and carrying out God's eternal purpose.

(2) To revive this, the true conception of the Church, is the main aim of our Society, and we believe that its revival would not merely help us to raise the tone and realise the power of our ministry but would increase enormously the spiritual life and power of the great body of the membership of the Church. We cannot for a moment doubt that the lowness of religious tone, the slackness of missionary effort, and the comparatively poor response to appeals for help in the work of the Church which are universally deplored may be traced ultimately to this one cause, that our people do not sufficiently realise—many of them indeed very dimly realise—what the Church means. Scarcely does their thought ever travel beyond its mere externals, or they confound it with the ministry in a common indifference; or what is even worse, they relapse into mere criticism of pulpit utterances. And all the while a precious inheritance is theirs of which they are missing the fulness and the power. By our life, by our work, by our worship, we are each and all to represent our Lord, Who is the Head of the Body of which we are members. Such is the great underlying idea of the Church in its uni-

versal and in its national aspect, the true priesthood of all Christian people, and it is nothing more nor less than a restoration of the true ideal of human life.

This is what the revival of a true conception of our relation to the Church would mean, and if it were as we would earnestly desire it to be, a predominating note in the minds of Christian people, none of us would be satisfied with the present meagre use of the means of grace. There would be fewer parishes in which the minimum of a single service on the Lord's Day would be regarded as sufficient. More of our churches would be open during the week, giving opportunity for daily public prayer. It would be impossible to refrain from the commemoration of the great Evangelical verities contained in the historic facts of the Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord, and the great gift of Pentecost. It would be impossible for a people so filled with a sense of their unity in Christ, to believe that the words "as *oft* as ye eat this bread" and the recommendation in our standards that Communion should be *frequent*, are satisfied by an annual, half-yearly, or quarterly celebration. There would be a more general desire to return at least to the practice, laid down in the Book of Common Order, of monthly communion, and that desire could never rest till the scriptural position was reached, so strongly affirmed by Calvin, that every Lord's Day should the Lord's Table be spread in the Lord's House. All these things would be inevitable results of a deeper sense of the fellowship in which we stand within the Church to our Supreme Head. For it would give a living and immediate force to thoughts and opinions which at present

scarcely go beyond personal ends. It would make our personal religion, which, even when most earnest, is apt to be limited, glow with the fire of divine fellowship. It would teach us not only to believe in the Fatherhood of God and to glory in the Cross of Christ, but to believe also in the Holy Ghost as the Lord and Giver of life, and to realise the Church of which by Baptism and through faith we are made members, to be "the body of Christ filled by that Spirit springing from and united with its glorified Head."

I have mentioned these two results of the revival of Churchmanship, the higher sense of divine calling in the Ministry and the elevation of the spiritual life of the people, because I believe they constitute the ends towards which we as a Society would direct all our efforts. And with these aims, we believe that our Society needs no defence with those who hold the principles of our Reformed forefathers. Maintaining these principles, we decline to descend to the rank of a sect denying the rock from which we were hewn. We believe that the true work of our Church is a positive and not a negative work, a work of building up and not mere denunciation and destruction. We stand as a national church in a somewhat unique and not altogether unsplendid isolation. On the one side are the great historic Churches of England, Greece and Rome, on the other our separated brethren in Scotland and elsewhere. Meanwhile we maintain our national testimony, refusing to be engulfed in the Scylla of Romanism or the Charybdis of dissent. What may be in store for us we cannot tell. But we believe it to be our duty,

as it is one of the declared aims of this Society, to labour "for the furtherance of Catholic Unity in every way consistent with true loyalty to the Church of Scotland," and we believe we can best do that by maintaining our heritage of doctrine and worship—those Church principles which our Reformers regarded as "a minimum admitting of no reduction whatever." In our confidence as to the apostolic character of the Scottish Church and Ministry we yield to none. Nor do we seek to unchurch those who in different historic conditions have developed their Church life under different forms of ritual and government. For it is permissible to hope that reunion may be one of the great features of the history of the twentieth century. And we realise that each stage in that holy work will be sound and stable only as it is based on the doctrine, from which the Scottish Church has never departed, of the Visible Church, which as Rutherford declares "has continued since the Apostles' time."

To assist in this work by reverent study of the great Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit is the central purpose of our present Conference, and we believe and trust that our work will commend itself to thoughtful Christian people of all forms of opinion who, though perhaps approaching the subject from different points of view, are agreed in their desire to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

The Relation of the Incarnation and the Redemptive Acts of our Lord to the Pentecostal Gift, of which He is Mediator.

REV. M. P. JOHNSTONE, B.D.

THE Incarnation of our Lord loses much of its significance if we isolate it from the history of the world as a whole. The conclusions of modern science, in one department especially, namely that of biology, give us no little assistance in forming a complete and adequate estimate of its meaning. These are found to set accepted facts in a new light, while they often afford an unexpected explanation of expressions and texts in Holy Scripture hitherto left in obscurity.

One large and solid dogma accepted by modern science is *the unity of the principle of life*. The stream is continuous not only in its length but in its breadth. It not only carries in solution the melted snows of its source, it has not only flowed from the first without pause, but it is also one and indivisible from bank to bank. It is not broken up; it never has been, and never will be, divided into rivulets unrelated to each other.

A generation ago, attention was concentrated less on the unity of life than on its multiplicity—the forms it took, its endless phases and variety. To-day its solidarity is more prominent: it is not the many members but the one body that we contemplate. The homogeneous unity of life through all its fractional expressions is the first principle of biology. The earthen vessels are secondary and evanescent: the treasure within is the same in all ages.

This principle, which seems to have become the bed-rock of science—one of the things which cannot be shaken—is plainly recognised in Holy Scripture, which consistently speaks of mankind as one, and repeatedly, though more rarely, of the wider unity which includes the whole animate creation.

The Old Testament does indeed draw distinctions between races and nations, between the Chosen People and the rest of mankind; but these are distinctions merely of calling, not of essence or origin. The whole race is regarded, alike in the Old and the New Testament, as substantially one, as one in its fall, and one in its hope of restoration. Much that S. Paul tells us of the way of Redemption can scarcely be understood at all unless we credit him with a very vivid and constant conception of all human life, from first to last, as a mysterious and mighty unity.

This unity does not, however, contain within itself the resources necessary for its progress and development. Behind and above the vast tide of life, Scripture reveals a Personal Force, exerting a continual pressure towards righteousness—a great Hand

never forsaking the balances of fate: a Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and Preserver of Men. God's presence and activity impart a superior vitality to every form of what is good—to the true in strife with the false, the righteous with the evil. Vengeance pursues iniquity to the third and fourth generation, but God's mercy follows them that keep His commandments to a thousand generations¹—practically for ever.

Behind all the catastrophes of life, this sleepless kindness of God watches and waits. Even in the worst times piety feels the actual goodness of God and confides in it. The unblossoming fig-tree and the fruitless vine, the empty stall and the silent fold, cannot destroy the assurance of that. Neither can death itself. "Though He slay me," says Job, in his affliction, "yet will I trust in Him."

This conviction expressed in Scripture appears to have its counterpart in what science tells us of the upward tendency she has discerned in operation from the very dawn of life. Every successive order of life has been higher than its precursor—more refined, more sensitive, capable of experience wider and more intense. The process has been so gradual that it is not observable with any degree of distinctness in the short span of even the longest individual life. Long views are needed, and the question must be asked of many generations, for one generation alone cannot answer it. But science, taking an age-long view, answers without hesitation that a gradient moving steadily upwards is perceptible along the whole path of her vision. A

¹ Deut. vii. 9.

ceaseless adaptation has been in progress whereby life in ascending forms has been growing more and more fit to rule and to utilise the material world. From the earliest moment of which she has cognisance, at every point on the long path of the history of life which she is able to examine, she finds tokens of an unbroken ascent to larger and better things. No doubt, certain obstinate phenomena still refuse to fall into line with this great conception of an unvarying advance towards ampler and nobler life. But in spite of them, Science, if we receive her witness, unhesitatingly describes the history of life on this planet by the word 'Excelsior.'

So large and momentous a fact as the descent in Jesus Christ of Eternity into time cannot of course be contained within the limits of the Evolution Theory. But much in Holy Scripture is a dead letter unless the Incarnation of our Lord be regarded as the emergence upon history of a type of life distinctively new. The Theory of Evolution helps us, moreover, in some measure to realise the magnitude of an event which fills to their farthest limits the bounds of space and time. The Church in her present popular teaching has allowed the manifestation of God in Christ to be viewed far too exclusively as an isolated and personal event, with the result that the perspective of Christian truth has been distorted, and faith been made needlessly difficult to many a devout and godly mind. Viewed without reference to the past ages of life in their secular progress, the Gospel narrative of the Birth of Christ is bewildering, barely credible. If nothing led up to it, if

nothing prepared for it, the difficulties of faith are immeasurably increased.

II. It is not sufficient, however, to regard the Incarnation as a mere step of progress in the natural sequence of development. Scripture contains the declaration that it is the planting of a new life on the earth. There is that strange expression of the angel to the Virgin Mary: "Wherefore also *that Holy Thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Here, surely, is the intimation of a new life, a nature holy, heavenly, spiritual. There are also the expressions used by S. Paul in the Epistle to the Corinthians, where he speaks of our Lord as made a quickening Spirit, the second Adam, the progenitor of a new and higher race. A man in Christ, he tells us also, is not an improved worldling, but a new creation.¹ He is not man illuminated, but man vitalised. He has not learned something more, but received something new. The "spiritual man" belongs to a different order from the "natural man," for he lives in a new world, and is conscious of new facts, for which the other man has no susceptibility—"for they are foolishness unto him." Our Lord Himself described the spiritual man as born anew, re-born as one might be who, from being mere animal, had been made a living soul.

Into the character of this spiritual creation—the order of "that Holy Thing"—it is beyond the scope of the present paper to enter. But it may well be observed how in the progress and consummation of the life of the Incarnate Christ this new order of life was linked with the old, amid which it appeared, and

¹ 2 Cor. v. 17, *καινή κτίσις*.

which it transformed. The Blessed One, manifested in the flesh, lifted, to a higher plane, a life which had already been lived by countless generations. He was the Son of an ancestry of every sort. In His holy Incarnation He sought and saved that which had already been lost. So the Holy Thing was grafted on the stock of the unholy fallen nature of man. But while the real blood relationship of JESUS to us is fearlessly maintained in Scripture, it is insisted on with equal clearness that here was something greater, purer, better, other than anything which had gone before Him. The care with which His human descent is emphasised by the Evangelists is matched by the vividness with which He Himself declares His divine mission and parentage,¹ as though it were fatal to our reception of the truth, if either hemisphere of His Being were left out of sight.

Similarly, He exhausted human language in endeavouring to excite in the disciples an expectation of the "Promise of the Father." In the institution of the Lord's Supper He told them that He Himself would be the life-blood in the veins of their being. "He took the cup and gave thanks, and said, Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the new testament."²

The Incarnation is therefore the entrance of a higher life and spirit into human nature. It ought, accordingly, to produce a new species of life, a spiritual species. "To as many as receive Him, to them (in turn) He gives power to become sons of God." And the Pentecostal gift is related to the Incarnation as the shedding abroad of this new life

¹ *e.g.* in S. John vi. 33, viii. 23.

² S. Matt. xxvi. 27.

and spirit, prepared, perfected, and finally liberated by the other redemptive acts of Christ.

Let us look back from the era of our Lord on the whole history of this divine work. The retrospect shows that there has been a yearning, a striving upwards towards Christ, quite in harmony with the biological theories of science. The world evidently, according to Scripture, was made for man, and man was made for Christ. He is the climax and the summit of all creation. He (the Incarnate Christ) was in the thought of God when things began to be. Without Him nothing was made that was made. History would have been other than it was, had no Christ been coming. Since the whole universe comes from one Mind, and is framed by one Hand, it has therefore a oneness of its own. He is the beginning because He is the end ; He was the first because He is the last ; He is the Alpha because He is the Omega. The prophets *felt* His coming. Foregleams of His spirit kindled a flickering light in them. Humanity in its nobler representatives instinctively recognised His day from afar off. Every life cleaner, purer than its fellows was a prophetic leap forward towards Him.

When the time was full He came, bringing with Him a more abundant life. But, according to His own words, there was some mysterious necessity which forbade the transmission of this life to others, not only until the sacred vessel which contained this treasure should be broken on Calvary, but also till Man in Him should be set in splendour at the right hand of God. The disciples heard the ripple of the

Living Water ; until the day of Pentecost they could not freely drink of it. The Holy Spirit, the New Life, was but the *Promise* of the Father until then. Before the promise became an accomplished fact, before the Spirit of Christ could become the spirit of the Christian, the nearly total eclipse in the weakness of this mortality must have passed away, every trace of the great obscuration must have disappeared. Our Lord may indirectly refer to this as to something that had recently taken place, in His great commission : " All power is given unto *Me* in heaven and in earth, go ye therefore."

As has been said already, no theory of the world is wide enough to embrace the Incarnation. It bursts through the confines of thought on every side : while transcending all systems, it succeeds in explaining and reconciling many of the anomalies and perplexities in the scheme of human life. That Christ should be the first-born of a new creation, that He should bring many sons and daughters unto God, making them through Himself partakers of the Divine Nature, is quite in the line of all we know of the progress of past ages. It is never His depressed and suffering humanity that we are called on to receive. *That* we are to consider, to revere, and to follow, but not to receive. It is into the glory of His Resurrection we are to enter ; it is by receiving not that which He had from Adam, but that which He possessed and perfected as His own, that we are called to live unto God.

The Relation of the Incarnation and the Redemptive Acts of our Lord to the Pentecostal Gift, of which He is Mediator.

REV. ARTHUR W. WOTHERSPOON, M.A.

WE speak of a great mystery when we speak concerning Christ and the Church:¹ and of this GIFT, the Holy Bond which makes us members of His Body, the Power from on high which gave to that Body form and life. Yet mystery as it is, we seem free to assert with confidence that all its voices, when interpreted aright, speak of our Incarnate Lord. It is He who, at a great price, has obtained this Gift for men. He is its immediate giver. And the end of the Gift is to unite us to Him, that Christ may be in us and we in Him, that as He lives so we may live, and that the Church may be in very truth His Body—He the Soul of it, and it His instrument and habitation, the Body and the Head one Christ.

When, therefore, we treat of the Pentecostal Gift, we do not speak simply of the Third Person

¹ Eph. v. 32.

of the Trinity, conceived of absolutely in His Eternal Being, but of Holy Spirit sent by Christ,¹ sent by the Father in Christ's name²—i.e. sent as from Christ and of Christ. The relation of the Pentecostal Gift to the Incarnation is, thus, of the closest ; not alone as obtained by the Incarnation, but as defined thereby in nature and mission. As given to us it is the Spirit of Christ,³ the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.⁴

I. Much of what follows in these pages might seem too obvious to find a place in them, were it not that in recent years statements have appeared which advocate a view different from that above stated. In these the Pentecostal Gift is regarded as the Holy Spirit in His absolute and normal Being, and it is taught that He dwells in the Christian in His simple and absolute Deity. As a consequence, there are claimed for Him—the Holy Ghost in His proper Eternal Being—those offices and that work in earth which are rather to be regarded as exercised through the Spirit by our Lord Jesus Christ as Head of the Church and King in His Kingdom.

The Holy Spirit (according to one of the writers in question) is the Administrator of the Church ; which He rules ; which is under His control. All its ministries and offices, “some Apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers,”⁵ are governments set over the Church by the authority and decision of the Holy Ghost. “The business of the Church in all its departments

¹ S. John xv. 26, xvi. 7.

² S. John xiv. 26.

³ Rom. viii. 9.

⁴ Rom. viii. 2.

⁵ Eph. iv. 11.

is" (it is said¹) "under the management of the Holy Spirit;" "the direction of affairs in the Kingdom is kept by the Spirit in His own power;" "He does all Himself in person, without intervention, even as He will;" He "supplies the place of Christ" throughout the present dispensation, which is named expressly "the Dispensation of the Spirit."

It must be enough to say of this phrase, "the Dispensation of the Spirit," that it is without warrant in Holy Scripture, and that it is not advisable for us, in the deep things of God, to invent phrases which tend to separate between the Persons of the Holy Trinity. Perhaps, indeed, in face of such views and phrases as are detailed or quoted above, our first wish is for escape from all such ideas into the great thought of the Unity of the Godhead. THE LORD OUR GOD IS ONE GOD. We may distinguish—we may not thus separate—the Persons of the Godhead.

When our Lord spoke of "another Paraclete" Who should come to His disciples, He at once went on to say, "I will not leave you orphaned: I come to you;"² and a moment later He was saying, *My Father also*, "We will come and make our abode with you."³ The Holy Spirit does not come alone. It could not be. Nor does He act as doing all "Himself in person, without intervention" (a strange, unfortunate phrase); but He comes, He acts, as bringing with Him the presence of GOD and the will of GOD. The Lord our God is One God. There can be no separation nor "intervention" nor difference of mind or will.

¹ By Dr. Elder Cumming, *Through the Eternal Spirit*, chap. xii.

² S. John xiv. 18.

³ S. John xiv. 23.

In speaking, however, not of the one Love, one Thought, and one Will of GOD, but of the historical dealings of God with man in order to man's salvation, we shall not err if we do distinguish the activities of the Father Who sends, of the Saviour Who is come, and of the Paraclete Who is given. In this relation it is the Incarnate Son of God Whom we must recognise as Him with Whom we have to do¹—the Saviour, and the Dispenser of the Eternal Salvation which He has obtained for us. He is "exalted a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance and remission of sins."² From "the throne of God and of the Lamb"³ the Living River bears to us the life of "the Living One."⁴ "There is no other Name under heaven that is given among men wherein we must be saved,"⁵ because He is the Son of Man, because He is the Incarnation.

Here we must take our stand; on the sole mediation of our Lord as Incarnate. "There is one God—one Mediator also between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus."⁶

If we refuse to follow any thought which separates the Persons of the Godhead, we must as steadfastly assert the ONE MEDIATOR: nothing won for man except by Christ, nothing given to man except through Christ and in Christ; Christ in all that man receives, and Christ in all because He is the one Mediator, the Author and the Perfecter of our faith;⁷ and, finally, CHRIST WITH US ALWAYS⁸ (not, thank God, "His place supplied"): Christ

¹ Heb. iv. 12, 13.² Acts. v. 31.³ Rev. xxii. 1.⁴ Rev. i. 18 (R.V.).⁵ Acts iv. 12 (R.V.).⁶ 1 Tim. ii. 5 (R.V.).⁷ Heb. xii. 2.⁸ S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

both reigning and ruling,¹ in His Kingdom : Christ all things to His Church and Head over all things :² Christ for all mankind, the Alpha and the Omega.³

So much (it may here be added) we must have understood, although the Pentecostal Gift had been declared in the New Testament scriptures (as in those of the Old Testament) by no name except that of "the Spirit," "Holy Spirit." Any question arising out of *name* would then have been left open.

But it is not left open. Repeatedly after Pentecost the Holy Spirit is declared under a new name, "the Spirit of Christ,"⁴ "the Spirit of Jesus Christ,"⁵ "the Spirit of (God's) Son,"⁶ "the Spirit of the Lord,"⁷ "the Spirit of Jesus,"⁸ and this in context which leaves no doubt that the Spirit is spoken of as a Person. It is unnecessary to urge the importance and significance of the names by which God is pleased to make Himself known : each successive name marking a new stage of revelation, and each name embodying a summary of doctrine regarding His Being, and the relation which He bears to man. Beyond controversy it means much that after Pentecost this new name of the Holy Ghost should have framed itself on the lips of the apostles and evangelists.

"When He the Spirit of truth is come . . . He shall not speak from Himself ; but what things soever He shall hear, these shall He speak. . . . He shall glorify Me, for He shall take of Mine, and shall declare it unto you."⁹ Even as the Son came in the

¹ I Cor. xv. 25. ² Eph. i. 22. ³ Rev. i. 8. ⁴ Rom. viii. 9.

⁵ Phil. i. 19. ⁶ Gal. iv. 6. ⁷ 2 Cor. iii. 17.

⁸ Acts xvi. 7 (R.V.). ⁹ S. John xvi. 13, 14.

name of the Father,¹ so the Holy Spirit comes in the name of the Son:² and even as the word which our Lord spoke was not His but the Father's,³ so that which is uttered by the Spirit is not His but Christ's;⁴ for as Christ came down from heaven to do the will of Him that sent Him,⁵ that is, of the Father, so the Holy Ghost came down from heaven to do the will of Him that sent Him, that is, of Christ. And whatever gifts are imparted by the Spirit (dividing to every man severally as He will), these are always gifts which Christ obtained for us, and are always imparted to those persons who "are the body of Christ, and members in particular."⁶

This is the utmost for which we contend. In so far as the devout writers to whom reference has been made, have emphasised the greatness of the Pentecostal Gift and have urged men to realise its power and blessing, we are absolutely at one with them. We differ from them on the sole point stated, venturing to apply to them, in a limited sense, Christ's word to His disciples in Samaria—*Ye know not what Spirit ye are of*: they have not understood that the Gift of Pentecost (which "was not" till Jesus was glorified, and which the world "cannot receive"), is the Spirit of the Son, the Spirit of the Lord; coming not in His own name but in that of Christ, through "the One Mediator, Himself man"—a gift both new and rich, as coloured by our Lord's humanity, and as bringing the virtue of His cross and resurrection.

"He that hath the Son hath life."⁷ That which is

¹ S. John v. 43.

² xiv. 26.

³ xiv. 24.

⁴ xvi. 13, 14.

⁵ vi. 38.

⁶ I Cor. xii. 11, 27.

⁷ S. John v. 12.

ours by the Spirit we have as members of Christ's body, as branches in the Holy Vine. The present Bishop of Durham, accordingly, has written: "While the Blessed Spirit is 'the Giver of Life' in respect of His immediate impartation of life eternal to the man, He is not Himself the Life. In the last analysis this Life is the Son of GOD, Jesus Christ, the incarnate, sacrificed, glorified Head of His true Church and of every true member. The Spirit is the eternal and divine personal vehicle; Jesus Christ, 'who is our Life'¹ is the Thing conveyed. . . . To borrow an imperfect analogy from physical science, Christ is as the Sun of the Soul, the Spirit is as the luminiferous Ether by whose vibration we have the Sun's light and heat."² The Spirit does not speak (nor give—He is Himself given) from Himself: but takes the things of Christ and declares them and makes them ours. The life and the strength of life, all the whole gift of the Spirit, are the strength and life of Christ Jesus, Himself man. We are taught on the one hand that apart from Him we have nothing, are nothing, can do nothing; on the other hand that "he who is joined to the Lord is one Spirit"³ with the Lord, and therefore lives—and yet not he but Christ lives in him. Our Lord as the Second Adam is made a quickening Spirit⁴—all power given unto Him, even this power to quicken whom He will, and so to make us members of Himself as that His very Soul shall penetrate and transfuse our being and

¹ Col. iii. 4.

² *Outlines of Christian Doctrine*, ch. vii. (2).

³ 1 Cor. vi. 17.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 45. See also 2 Cor. iii. 17 (R.V.), "The Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

His mind be in us and we be "one Spirit" with Him.

This is the sum of all. The Holy Ghost so comes and so is given as that the Incarnation is extended and fulfilled. Heaven opens at Pentecost and this glory of the Lord Jesus shines forth—a glory as of the Son of Man enthroned on the right hand of GOD, glorified¹ as Man with the glory which He had with God before the world was² and made as Man to be a life-giving Spirit³—shining forth therefore in this glory of the Christ Mystical Whose body is the Church.

Dr. Westcott writes of Pentecost⁴ that "this descent, this incorporation, of the Spirit was in some sense a second Divine Nativity, the birth of the Church." To be preferred, however, is the phrase already quoted which describes the event of Pentecost as an Extension of the Incarnation. It was indeed the Church's birthday, but the Church—the second Eve—came to life mature as taken from the Saviour's side, bone of His bone, flesh of His flesh,⁵ and Spirit of His Spirit. It was a fulfilling of the *one* Divine Nativity—an extension of the one Divine Incarnation.

The Pentecostal Gift is the Holy Ghost as given within the sphere of Christ Jesus (as He said "in My name"): coming, therefore, to men not by direct gift from GOD, but as given to Christ and reaching us in that we are members of Christ. The Spirit as we receive Him is "the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus"⁶—Christ's own Spirit, at once Divine

¹ S. John xii. 23. ² xvii. 1, 5. ³ 1 Cor. xv. 45.

⁴ *The Historic Faith*, ch. viii. ⁵ Gen. ii. 23. ⁶ Rom. viii. 2.

and human: received that we might have "the Life, that eternal Life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us":¹ and might bring forth the fruit of the Spirit,² even of His Spirit, in all the blessed human ways of the truth and goodness of our Lord Jesus—and might so be changed³ more and more unto His likeness as by the Spirit of the Lord.

II. Such, then, as we read the Scripture, is the relation of the Pentecostal gift to the Incarnation. With regard to the redemptive acts of our Lord and the relation of the Gift thereto, the Scripture speaks expressly: "God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts."⁴ And, again, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us . . . that we might receive the promise of the Spirit."⁵

It was necessary, in the nature of things, that this redemption should precede the coming of the Spirit. For "the temple of God is holy";⁶ that heart into which He enters to abide must either be pure, as the heart of Jesus was, or purified and cleansed as our hearts are when "sprinkled from an evil conscience"⁷ by the blood of the atonement. Until Jesus was glorified, until Christ as our High Priest "through His own blood, entered in once for all into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption,"⁸

¹ 1 John i. 2 (R.V.).

² Gal. v. 22.

³ 2 Cor. iii. 18.

⁴ Gal. iv. 4.

⁵ Gal. iii. 13, 14 (R.V.).

⁶ 1 Cor. iii. 17.

⁷ Heb. x. 22.

⁸ ix. 11, 12 (R.V.).

Spirit was not (given):¹ "was not" until Christ in His one offering had perfected for ever them that are sanctified.²

This does not imply that the Creator-Spirit has not everywhere in all ages striven with men, and led and enlightened those in every nation who set their face God-wards. Still less does it ignore the specific inspiration of the Hebrew prophets. It means that, as these prophets foretold, God has now done a new thing³—unknown under the Old Testament and incredible⁴ to the men of the Old Testament.

God spake to the fathers by the prophets, but the manifestation of the Spirit so given finds perhaps its nearest parallel under the New Testament, *not* in the life-giving Spirit which is now poured out, but rather in those exceptional gifts of tongues and of prophecy which accompanied the Pentecostal Gift in some of its recipients. Prophecy is old, and the gift of understanding mysteries or of healing, is old; but the more excellent way is new, charity is new—the love that is long-suffering and kind and humble, that seeketh not her own, that thinketh no evil, that beareth all things; this love that fulfils the law is new, and this faith that conquers, and this hope that is an anchor to the soul—the fruit of the Spirit of the Lord Jesus. It is one thing to inspire, to make a prophet; another thing to sanctify, to make a good man.

¹ S. John vii. 39 (οὐπω ἦν πνεῦμα), "When the term occurs in this form (*i.e.*, without the article) it marks an operation, or manifestation, or gift of the Spirit, and not the personal Spirit." Westcott, *Commentary*.

² Heb. x. 14.

³ Is. xliii. 19.

⁴ Heb. i. 5.

The Spirit of Jehovah *came upon* the chosen man of Israel (whether a Saul or a David) as a power from without; not to abide, and not to reach the springs of the man's life for its renewal. When the Spirit of Jehovah departed from Saul, the withdrawal of the gift left him as the gift had found him—no better in himself and no nearer God. The case of Balaam the false prophet (more accurately, the true prophet but false man) is an extreme illustration of the same. That their gift was not as our gift is clear to demonstration. Nor, indeed, do we require in proof of this to compare the Christian disciple with such men as Saul or Balaam. Although we took for example the strong, majestic David, the promise which looked forward to Messiah was "he that is feeble shall in that day be as David";¹ and although we took Abraham, Samuel, Elijah, it was our Lord Himself who set John His fore-runner beside the greatest of them all, yet added, "he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he."²

For the least in the Kingdom is born from above, of God. John was the herald of the Kingdom, but did not live to see it come in power. He was the friend of the Bridegroom, and God's loyal servant; yet he had not this that is given to us, even to the least—to be no more a servant but a son, and to be of the Church, which is Christ's very Bride.

III. The Pentecostal Gift is, then, HOLY SPIRIT at once Divine and human, being mediated by the ascended Lord, Himself Man.

"It was requisite that the Mediator should be God

¹ Zech. xii. 8.

² S. Luke vii. 28.

*that He might give His Spirit (to His people)."*¹

The words are weighty, recognising the two essentials: that as Mediator Christ must give us His own Spirit, and that to give the Divine Spirit He must be God. The Mediator must be God, else He had not This to give. And He must give *This* if indeed He is to mediate between God and man—His own Spirit as the God-man, not given from without but from within humanity: thus fulfilling the atonement, God and man made one.

Christ is God, and He gives to us His Spirit: He is man, and the Spirit given by Him is akin to them that receive the gift. *It was requisite* (if I may turn the phrase) *that the Mediator should be man* in order that His Spirit as given us should have lived through a human life; should have prayed, toiled, suffered, known grief and temptation and all pain, enduring to the end through the darkest of a human experience. *It was requisite* (to say all in a word) that the Mediator should be the Christ Whom we know, true man and very God, in order that He might give us that same Spirit Whom also we know:² Who has gifts for all, for the child out of Jesus' holy childhood, for the lad out of Jesus' holy youth, and for the man out of that manhood of Nazareth "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners": Who has gifts for all—for the penitent, peace which the Lord has made by the blood of His Cross; and for the saint, that deeper peace which Jesus called His own, which went with Him through His passion: Who has strength also for the tempted since Jesus suffered being tempted, and Who is in us the Spirit of faith because Jesus

¹ *Larger Catechism*, Q. 38.

² S. John, xiv. 17.

walked by faith and the Spirit of grace and supplication because Jesus lived by prayer.

This is the Spirit Whom the world cannot receive, for it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him ; but we know Him, for He dwelt with us in Christ, and being in us now, we know Him that He is indeed the same Spirit Whose temple was the humanity of Christ Jesus.

If this be the case with regard to our Lord's grace through the Spirit for the individual, His gifts to the Church as His body are similarly endowments out of His own authority and office. He gave some, apostles—as He is Himself the apostle and high priest of our profession ; and some, prophets—as He is that prophet whom Jehovah had promised to raise up ; and some, evangelists—as He Himself heralded the Kingdom widely, in Galilee and in the realms of the dead ;¹ and some, pastors and teachers—as He is Himself the Chief Shepherd. The Gospels may close with our Lord's Ascension ; yet confessedly they tell only what Jesus “ began to do and teach ” :² He being ascended and His Spirit being given, His disciples went forth, the Lord also working with them, with signs following.³ It is not that Christ began a work which now is continued by another, but that Christ continues His work through the Holy Ghost.

Such, then, we submit, is the relation of the Pentecostal Gift to the Incarnation and to the Redemptive acts of our Lord. The Incarnation is fulfilled through Pentecost in the wider Incarnation, which is in His mystical Body the Church. Christ

¹ S. Peter, iii. 18, 19.

² Acts, i. 1.

³ S. Mark, xvi. 19.

loved the Church, and gave Himself for it. At Pentecost He found what He had sought by His Cross and Passion—the Shepherd found His flock (without which He were not Shepherd) and the King His Kingdom, and the Bridegroom His espoused. The coming of the Spirit gives us Christ present ; all authority His ; with us all the days even to the end of the age.

Thus the Church is Christ's fulness—that which He fills, and by which He fulfils Himself in the world of mankind. For the world, all mankind, shares in the blessing of Pentecost. If the Spirit is God's gift to the Church alone, yet the Church is His gift—a sacrament of visible and invisible—to the world. At Pentecost we stand at a meeting of waters—one the long stream of human life that took rise in Eden, and one the pure river, clear as crystal, that flows from the throne of God and of the Lamb—of the Lamb who was slain and hath redeemed us out of every people and kindred and tongue and nation. Everything shall live whithersoever the river cometh, and one day it will reach the sea—the tumult of the peoples—and heal the bitter sea itself.

The Pentecostal Gift to the Church as distinguished from the work of the Spirit of God towards Humanity at large.

REV. A. STUART MARTIN, B.D.

THE subject indicates two spheres of the work of God's Spirit, viz. His work in the world and His work in the Church ; and involves three distinctions, none of which may be ignored, viz. (*a*) the spirit in man ; (*b*) and that spirit as acted upon by the Divine Spirit in His natural operation, and (*c*) in His supernatural or specifically Christian operation. Let us keep *those three distinctions* in view. All sound theology, like all true philosophy, rests on right distinctions ; and nowhere, perhaps, more than in this doctrine of the Spirit may Christian thought profitably seek valid distinctions. For here there is special liability to error through confusion. There is no fact greater than the Spirit of God ; there is no experience more rich or real than His working ; yet there is no Christian fact or experience more difficult to define. Psychologically to separate those moral forces which God has implanted in the soul of man from the operations of His Spirit in and with them, whether natural or supernatural, is a task calling for

exquisite moral discernment, subtlety, and discrimination. So largely does the Spirit work out of sight; so self-effacing is God in man, that only the purest in heart can see Him. Nevertheless it is only as we thus see Him in His working separately, that we shall realise both His reality and His fulness of gift. Blindness to this truth constitutes a leading heresy of recent religious thought, the confusion of the spirit of man with the Spirit of God, and the consequent denial of supernatural grace. Just as there is a Christological heresy according to which the human and divine natures in Christ's person become so inter-fused with the attributes of each other as to lose their personal identity, giving as result a something neither human nor divine, so in like manner in the doctrine of the Spirit there is a similar danger. All distinction between the Spirit of God and the spirit in man is obliterated, and all diversity of operation of the former is denied. A unity is thus secured in a crude mysticism which however widely embraced in certain pseudo-scientific and theosophical circles outside the Church, as well as in much so-called Broad Churchism within the Church, is a unity neither of reason nor of religion, but is what one who though not a professed theologian was a deep thinker on Nature's processes, Lord Bacon, terms "the unwholesome blending of the human and divine, from which there result not only a phantastical philosophy, but an heretical religion." Catholic thinkers who still see a deep necessity for retaining those ancient distinctions in which the Church, with prolonged labour of intellect, has defined the faith, and in which she sees profound

spiritual verities enshrined, are because of this often charged with want of intellectual insight. Yet to distinguish things which differ, but which at first sight do not seem to differ, requires more intellect than to confuse or ignore the differences. Confusion is essentially superficial. The beginnings of religion in Paganism are everywhere characterised by the confusion of the Divine Being with physical nature. Modern unbelief is characterised by the confusion of the Divine Being with human nature. If such confusion betokens the infant mind in the former case, it does so no less in the latter.

The Spirit of God then is to be distinguished from the spirit in man. He is, however, equally to be related to the spirit in man. And, in the first place, *man as part of nature* is under the hand of God. Here modern science renders invaluable aid. Physical investigators in their patient analysis of material things are increasingly unable to dispense with an universal intelligence as the cause of all that is. Behind the facts they tabulate there is a nameless invisible somewhat ever eluding while it ever confronts them; an all-pervading unity of energy which apparently possesses the characteristics of thought, love, moral purpose; a spirit of evolution which intelligently, irresistibly, continuously 'shapes our ends.' Nothing is more remarkable in the history of recent speculation than the turn thought has here taken. Reason in the old coldly abstract sense has given place to Will as the test of reality. The world is regarded as the manifesto not simply of Reason, but of Will. The Author of nature is a cause and more; He is a Spirit. In the infinite

activity of this central creative Power we recognise God in outflowing natural life. That which science still terms a formless Force, an immanent Energy, and philosophy the spiritual principle in nature, touches with secret influence all creatures, creating, supporting, evolving, both new forms of life and the nobler instincts of man.

That Formless Force becomes cognoscible at Pentecost as the Holy Ghost. The revelation at Pentecost manifested the Spirit not absolutely new, but in new aspects, in fresh quality, in more personal character. Throughout Scripture that same Spirit which was given in fullest measure at Pentecost is revealed to us as the Spirit whose energy and interest are actively occupied in the natural spheres. He is manifested as brooding over the face of the waters, developing the germs of life ; and again after the Flood as renewing the face of the earth. He is revealed as giving skill and understanding to the architect of the tabernacle ; as giving strength to the physical nature of Samson ; as instructing the husbandman, *i.e.* as teaching the practical arts and sciences of life. The physical gifts of the body come from Him ; also the intellectual gifts of the mind. In this connection it is to be noted that He prepares the human body of Christ in the Incarnation. His operation is also seen in the Resurrection of the body, both of Christ and of all believers. Thus we find the Spirit relating Himself to and occupying Himself with not only the spiritual life of man, but also his physical and external life, with what we call his natural gifts, which natural gifts are thus also spiritual. For the

same reason all through Scripture we find the presence of the Spirit symbolised. We see Him coming in the cloud, the dew, the dove, in the human breath of the Lord, in the tongues of fire, in the rushing mighty wind. And later on He is symbolically revealed to us not only in the seven lamps of fire burning before the Throne, but also in the pure river of water of life proceeding out of the Throne of God and of the Lamb. All through Scripture that great truth is implied which the Nature-mystics have perverted in seeking to express it, that truth which the higher thought of the present day is rediscovering with a thrill of joy, the truth so valuable both for science and faith, the truth which in the end is the only real reconciliation between science and religion, the truth, viz. that there is no essential antithesis, no necessary antagonism between the natural and the supernatural. The laws of Nature are the ways of the Spirit Who utters Himself through the forms of Nature. Thus, too, what men call miracle is better regarded not as interference with nature so much as the exceptional births or workings of Nature moulded by the unknown powers of Spirit ; what men call revelation is a communication to the world from without, and just as truly a development within the world, an unfolding of consciousness equally as a transference of knowledge ; what men call providence is the orderly control of the world by the resident powers of Spirit in the world. Prayer is converse with the Spirit, in whom we live and move and have our being. Thus all Nature is ensphered in Spirit, the Spirit of God.

Of man as part of Nature this is assuredly true ;

and of man in all aspects of his nature, but especially in the higher, viz. the moral and spiritual aspects. The moral progress of humanity is the result of the Divine Spirit working in man after that manner which is called by St. John 'convincing.' "He shall convince the world concerning sin and righteousness and judgment." The convincing of the Spirit relates to the supreme moral issues of human existence; it produces in men settled certainty on these issues; it imparts abiding convictions regarding them; it implants the conviction of what sin is, of what righteousness is, and both of what the judgment of God between sin and righteousness is, and of what the judgment of men between these ought to be; in short, in His work of convincing the world the Spirit is the teacher of humanity concerning good and evil, right and wrong, and the relation between the two. So long as the struggle goes on, the struggle between right and wrong, it is by the Spirit of God, who moves on the face of humanity. The general evil is brought home to the general conscience; the ideal of righteousness is made clearer to the general mind; the right judgment between the two great opposites is made plainer, and the higher goodness as over against the common sin is slowly brought to its place in human life. This is moral progress of the race. Men may think that the progress is entirely their own, and may pride themselves on the success that attends it. But it is in reality a progress as well as a process, in which man's spirit is enlarged, enriched, ennobled, brought to consciousness of needs he himself cannot meet, but as to which he is sure

“the inspiration of the Almighty giveth understanding.” In every upward struggle of humanity men have only been expressing the new infusion of the Spirit’s force. And where men have not gone upward, but only continued onward, even then it has required the Spirit to keep them to their attainment. It is not probable that God has at any time, or in any part of its great life, left the world entirely uninfluenced by His Spirit. Nowhere has good grown up apart from God, or without His fostering care. Awakenings of public conscience, deepening of conviction as to right and wrong, higher and truer views as to good and evil, reforms and changes for the better in actual life, quickenings of religion—these are workings of the Spirit acting in and with the powers He has given to humanity. White-robed angels once glided noiselessly through the streets of Sodom’s reeking vice ; not stranger is the persistence of virtue, purity, goodness, love, through all the deadly antagonisms which surround them : that persistence is by the energy of the Spirit. To deny it is to be blind to God. Denial of it is, however, by no means uncommon—even within the Church. In the practical piety of many a narrow conception of conversion, and, in the dogmatics of at least one influential Continental school, an impoverished notion of the Divine Omnipresence, decline to trace the power of the Spirit anywhere outside the soul ; and even these discern it only in certain emotions of the soul. Such men are not faithful to that ancient faith which loved to affirm the *anima naturaliter Christiana* : they restrict both the range of the Divine Outlook and of Christ’s Indwelling. Creation

is not left to itself or the Evil One, nor history to chance: both are instinct and tremulous with the Spirit's motions. There is no spot where God is not. There is no history that is only secular.

But, again, there is a *second aspect of the Divine Spirit in relation to the spirit in man*. Is the operation of the Spirit of God exhausted in the natural and general sphere? Or has He other gifts to bestow? Both Nature and revelation affirm that He has. It is only needful to contrast the ideas of sin and of holiness in the Gospel with those in the heathen world, to be impressed with the inadequacy, inconsistency, and in part impotence of the latter. Everywhere over the world the Spirit is seen hovering near to men, touching their wills, swaying their minds, guiding them, but nowhere is He seen in personal presence. He is so seen in the Church. This is the special glory of the Church; the personal indwelling presence of the Spirit—the Holy Spirit. The Church is His habitation: she is the temple of the Spirit of God. The Church receives influences of the Spirit which the world does not. There are, as we have seen, gifts which the world can receive; but the Spirit's most intimate and characteristic gifts are reserved for the Church, for believers who alone consciously know Him. Within the Church the Spirit acts on the soul in the three modes of revelation, regeneration, sanctification. As the Holy Spirit comes to us not immediately from the Godhead, but through Christ, so His gifts are mediated to men through Christ's ordinances.

These gifts so specific may only be imparted to

those fit to receive. It is only in the realm of high reality which experience opens to believers that the Spirit can bestow them ; for Grace is given unto Grace. In that realm, however, the Spirit is the inexhaustible source of spiritual treasure, ever opening up new glimpses of truth and new visions of God, revealing and glorifying Christ, guiding His disciples into fuller truth and holiness. There His presence and His grace will be perpetual ; for there is enough in Christ to enrich all ages. Oh that the Church may always have faith to receive !

That Presence and these Gifts are the Treasure as well as the Glory of the Church. To her they secure her divine character, and to her truth and ordinances their infallible force. Refuse that Presence and those Gifts, and you reduce the Christian faith to the level of the natural religions and rob the Church of her supernatural Grace. "It was the heavenly Christ," writes one, "who filled the early Christians with hope and enthusiasm." It was. And it is so still. The one Faith and the one Church that can resist and redeem the world is that religion whose truths are all alive through the Truth, and that Church whose ministry and services are quickened by the Living Spirit.

The Pentecostal Gift as distinguished from the work of the Spirit of God towards humanity at large.

REV. J. M. KIRKPATRICK, B.D.

IT is assumed that there is a general work of the Holy Spirit towards mankind at large, and a special work, characterised by distinctive features, which was inaugurated at Pentecost, and has the Church for its sphere. To indicate the distinctions between these two modes of operation is the aim of the following notes, which in a subject of so great difficulty must be considered as intended to be tentative rather than assertive.

I. A distinction of a very pronounced kind is suggested by those texts of Scripture which bear upon the subject. So clear a line do they draw between the natural state of man and the state of those who are made partakers in JESUS CHRIST of the Holy Spirit. "The Spirit of Truth," our Lord says, "whom the world cannot receive, because it beholdeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; ye know Him." "The natural man," says S. Paul, "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of GOD . . . and he cannot know them because they are spiritually judged;"

and again, "They that are after the flesh, do mind the things of the flesh, but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit."¹ These Scriptures teach apparently that between the work of the HOLY SPIRIT towards mankind at large, and the Pentecostal gift to the Church there is not less than a difference in kind. The opinion frequently expressed that there is but a difference in degree, surely does not harmonise with or satisfy expressions such as those quoted from our Lord and the Apostle Paul. There must be a distinction in kind, if a world whose individual elements are susceptible of the work of the Spirit towards mankind at large, is nevertheless so incapable, as is thus stated, of receiving Him as given at Pentecost.

2. It is fully admitted that apart from the Pentecostal outpouring there exists and has always existed an influence of the Holy Spirit on mankind at large. That there is such forms, indeed, matter rather of inference than of plain revelation. In the Old Testament there are, certainly, numerous references to the Holy Spirit. But the statements of His influence on the prophets or on the natural faculties of the craftsmen who built the tabernacle, or the consciousness of Him expressed in the 51st Psalm, do not really amount to examples of His world-wide working. For these occurred within the sphere of the historical development of the Kingdom of GOD, among men who were in a special relation to GOD as members of the race chosen to receive the message of revelation.

Yet there must be a work of the Spirit towards

¹ S. John xiv. 17; 1 Cor. ii. 14; Rom. viii. 5 (R.V.).

mankind at large, because there is a work of GOD towards all, and the Persons of the Holy Trinity co-operate in every divine work. If in GOD "we live and move and have our being," that is by the Spirit of GOD. For He is ever "the agent by whom intercourse between the Almighty and man is effected and maintained."¹ And therefore, when S. Paul acknowledges, as he repeatedly does, the presence of good in the heathen world, he justifies us in believing that every good, true, and noble thing in man's being and history has been inspired by the Holy Spirit. But we must not, on that account, think of the Pentecostal Gift as being merely a more constant or more powerful manifestation of that same activity which had been in operation in relation to man since his creation.

3. The Pentecostal Gift is differentiated by a distinction in mission. (a) In the Pentecostal Gift, the Holy Spirit is mediated by our Lord Jesus Christ. The specific conditions of the mission of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost are clearly stated in S. Peter's words: "Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He (*i.e.* JESUS) hath poured forth this."² The Gift is first given to Christ,—to the incarnate Son, Who has suffered and died, has risen from the dead, and ascended to the right hand of the Father. And then by Him It is given to His own.

The Gift is equally clearly connected, by our Lord, with Himself and His own work. "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another

¹ Milligan, *Ascension*, p. 207.

² Acts ii. 33 (R.V.).

Comforter";¹ "If I go, I will send Him (the Comforter) unto you"; "the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name"; "the Comforter . . . whom I will send unto you from the Father." By creation, and because of the natural relation in which all men stand to GOD as His creatures, there is a work towards them of the SPIRIT of GOD,—in their conscience, mind, will. Through the work of the incarnate Saviour, by the power of the Redemption fulfilled by Him, and of the Heavenly Intercession which He continuously offers, there is further communication of the Holy Ghost, distinguished from the former in *mission*, in that It is given through JESUS CHRIST, given in His name, and therefore not to all mankind, but to those who are in His name, who in His name draw near to the Father.

(b) It is to be observed, also, that the Pentecostal Gift is always directly given by Christ. He continues giving this Gift to His own. His work was not merely to render it possible for the Holy Spirit to come in this new power. He did not merely open for the advent of the Holy Ghost a way, hitherto barred, and then, as it were, step aside from between the Holy Ghost and human souls. He continues interceding, and in that continual intercession receives and imparts the Promise of the Father. Christ sent forth the Gift on the day of Pentecost, and the mission of that Gift is by and through the active Mediation and Bestowal of Christ always and for ever.

¹ S. John xiv. 16; xvi. 7; xiv. 26; xv. 26 (R.V.).

(c) The Mediation of Christ so intimately affects the Pentecostal Gift, that the Holy Ghost is given as the Spirit of Christ Jesus. So He is called the "Spirit of Christ,"¹ even, perhaps, the "Spirit of Jesus."² The purpose of the Pentecostal Gift is to constitute the Presence of Christ in His Church. The Holy Ghost is given to the Church as the Spirit of Christ Jesus—informing the Body of Christ with the mind and the will of Christ. The Holy Ghost as given at Pentecost comes to us through the glorified Humanity of Christ, and so comes enriched with the precious vitalizing and transforming powers of that Humanity. The Pentecostal Gift is sent forth by Christ, that so giving, He may give Himself to those who are given to Him by the merciful will of the Father.

4. There follows from this distinction in mission a distinction in Sphere. In the Pentecostal Gift the Spirit is the Spirit of a new creation, a world created according to a new divine intention and idea. "The Father," says S. Basil, "is the Original Cause of all things that are made; the Son the Creative Cause; the Spirit the Perfecting Cause. All things subsist by the Will of the Father, are brought into being by the Operation of the Son, and perfected by the Presence of the Spirit." This is true also of the New Creation. Of that He is the Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, and His work is to perfect the elements of the New Creation, the Church, according to the idea of it in Jesus Christ. His aim is to quicken these elements with the life of Christ, and to perfect

¹ Rom. viii. 9.

² Acts xvi. 7 (R.V.).

them into the likeness and mind of Christ. The Pentecostal Gift is distinct from the Work of the Spirit towards mankind at large, inasmuch as it is a gift manifesting the Holy Ghost to be the Spirit of the New Creation, the "Perfecting Cause" of the world to come.

Continually
cause.

This work of the Holy Spirit is twofold, and answers to His twofold work upon the Incarnate Christ. Our Lord's assumption of human nature was wrought through the Spirit: He was conceived by the Holy Ghost. The human nature thus united to the Son of God was then endowed by the Holy Ghost to accomplish the work appointed by the Father. This was effected when the Spirit descended like a dove on our Lord at His baptism. From that point JESUS Himself declared that He worked in the power of an Endowment from the Holy Spirit. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, He hath anointed me. . . . This day," He said, "is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." His miracles also were worked in the power of the Spirit. "If I by the finger of God cast out devils"—the finger of God meaning the Spirit. By the operation of the Holy Ghost, therefore, a humanity assumed into union with Deity was constituted in the person of our Lord, and by the Holy Ghost He was endowed for the fulfilment of His ministry.

The same twofold operation is characteristic of the Pentecostal Gift. The Spirit constitutes the New Creation. He constitutes chosen men a new creation in Christ, bringing them into a new state of being, a new sphere of existence, a new nature. Thus He is the Spirit of *Life*. And His presence is shown by




①

(2) the production of the graces of Christian character, the fruits of the Spirit—love, joy, peace, gentleness, patience. Whom He has constituted He also endows, showing Himself, in this way, as the Spirit of *Power*, bestowing, not from without, but by His presence within, the *gifts* of the Spirit, fitting men in the Church for the work to which they are called.

5. In the sphere of the New Creation, as the Spirit of Christ, the Holy Spirit has a new relation to men. This is expressed in the phrase repeatedly used of Him, "dwelling in" men; in the Church as a body, and also in individual souls. This phrase "dwelling" speaks of a new permanence and a new intimacy. These are two striking distinctions of the Pentecostal Gift. One of the features of the work of the Spirit, even in the Old Testament, is the lack of this permanence. And this was due to there being no way for the Spirit to an intimate inner union with the spirit of men. Men's consciences, minds, and special faculties could be influenced, but into the essence of their being the Holy Spirit did not enter to " dwell." But now, the Holy Spirit being in perfect union with the true human nature of Jesus Christ is able to penetrate into and embrace the very ground of man's spirit and being. And so He dwells in men, being able to affect and reconstitute the essential nature of men. This infinitely greater intimacy is a distinction of the Pentecostal Gift. Not, so to speak, are the mere attributes of men alone touched, but their very being is laid hold of. The Gift is a principle of life within—a principle of life in the very spring of their being, and therefore able really to transform men into

new beings, working as He does at the deepest root of their nature.

6. There is one point still to which attention might be drawn. "The Comforter," says our Lord, "when He is come, will convict the world with respect of sin and of righteousness and of judgment ; of sin, because they believe not on Me ; of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold Me no more ; of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged." These verses may be interpreted as referring to an action of the Holy Ghost upon mankind, not directly, but through the medium of the Church. But they suggest a question whether any modification of the work of the Holy Spirit towards mankind at large has resulted from the fulfilment of the redeeming acts of Christ. Unless the Holy Spirit proceeds in two different ways, as is surely inconceivable, and still to mankind at large merely from the Father and the Eternal Word, even the work towards the world at large must be affected by the Incarnation and Glorification of Christ. Even on mankind at large He must work in some way as the Spirit of Christ. The "entering" and "dwelling" might, it may be supposed, be absent from this action, but much of what we see of the change in common standards and tastes, and of a conformity of social ways and ideals to the teaching of the Gospel may be recognised as the work of the Spirit, as well as that prevenient grace which has been found preparing the way before the missionary efforts of the Church.



The Relation of the Pentecostal Gift to the Operations of Grace, through the Ordinances of the Lord—In the Church.

REV. ROGER S. KIRKPATRICK, B.D.

WE have to discuss under this head the relation between two things—these, namely, the Pentecostal Gift and the Ordinances of the Lord in the Church.

The Pentecostal Gift is, as we have seen, the abiding Presence in the Church of the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Incarnate and Glorified Son.

The Ordinances of the Lord are not themselves an outcome of this Pentecostal Gift; they are in strict accuracy Christ's own institution. We must, of course, believe that all the commandments of the Lord, as indeed all His words, were delivered and received through the power of the Holy Ghost. But the ordinances established in the church—preaching, prayer, baptism, the eucharist, and doubtless many other though unrecorded enactments of the Kingdom, contained in the teaching of

that period of forty days which intervened between the Resurrection and the Ascension—were actually appointed *before* the Pentecostal dispensation of the Spirit. When the Holy Ghost was given at Pentecost, there had already been provided, and committed to a Body of Disciples prepared and instructed by anticipation, the framework of Divine Ordinances which are the distinctive institutions of the Church. They depend for their primary authority, not upon the inner witness of the Spirit, but upon the external and historic commandment of the Lord. That is their foundation: and that is their permanent safeguard against the self-will and presumption of those who claim a spirituality superior to all definite observances.

What, then, is the relation of the Pentecostal Gift to these ordinances?

On the one hand it is evident that these ordinances are not effective except through the power of the Holy Ghost. This may be freely admitted without thereby denying the efficacy of any of our Lord's own words or works during His sojourn upon earth. His whole ministry on earth was a ministry in the power of the Holy Spirit. It was full of grace and truth. But greater words and works were to follow as a consequence of His Ascension to the Father. Thenceforth His ministry—a ministry from Heaven—was to be effected by a new dispensation of the Holy Ghost, with clearer light and fuller power, bringing the riches of His Incarnate and Glorified Personality into such contact with the members of His Body as was unknown and impossible before. And, without this new dispensation, the

Ordinances of the Church, when bereft of Christ's visible Presence, would have become a mere code of dead and inoperative legislation. To disregard that truth in practice is to lapse into absolute formalism. To ignore it in theory is to repeat concerning the continuity of the Church the same exploded error which Deism maintained concerning the continuity of the material creation. The notion of a mechanical Church is as entirely inadmissible as the notion of a mechanical universe. The Church is the Body of Christ; and the ordinances of the Church are without efficacy unless the energy of His heavenly Life, which is the virtue of the Pentecostal Gift, circulates in that Body through them.

On the other hand, no less evident is it that the Pentecostal Gift is not regularly operative except through the ordinances of the Church. Whether that gift is ever operative apart from faithful and loving obedience to these ordinances is a question which one hesitates to answer hastily. The ready affirmative often maintained is really based upon careless observation. We are pointed to the manifest fruits of the spirit exhibited in the lives of men who are living separate from the communion of the Church. We are reminded of the unexpected calls which come to the soul from the unseen world, of sudden conversions which cannot be denied, of personal experiences vouchsafed, of the mysterious voices, the fitful glimpses, the beams of heavenly light, the visions of the joy and glory of God's kingdom which from time to time break in unsought for upon religious consciousness. But, with regard to

the former instances—the grace exhibited outside the communion of the Church—it ought to be remarked that such fruits of the Spirit, though often coincident with neglect of certain ordinances of the Lord, so far from being independent of His ordinances generally, are really consequent upon a very earnest use of other ordinances not neglected, and especially upon a very earnest use of the Word of God and prayer. And, with regard to the instances of the latter type—the unsought for experiences of grace—the relevancy of their significance has not been established, unless it can be shown that such spiritual experiences are permitted to those by whom none of the means of grace have ever been employed. The reality of these experiences I do not question. I believe that the Presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church is not only as a River making glad the city of God—a River continually proceeding from the Throne of God and of the Lamb, but also as a wind that bloweth where it listeth. I believe that spiritual blessings not only are found by those who seek, but also seek for those who have the capacity to receive them. I believe that the Pentecostal Spirit does not only wait for the human cry, but also cries to the human soul, and, as the Finger of God, mysteriously touches now this man and now that, beckoning them to some high purpose or mission or destiny of grace. But, can any instance be adduced of any such operation of the Spirit which does not involve the appropriation and the employment by the Spirit of some prior teaching, of some prior training, of some prior contact with the means of grace? Can any instance be adduced of a person who,

though completely isolated from every breath of Christian instruction and influence, has yet been brought through the immediate outpouring of the Spirit to know, to acknowledge, and to receive the Saviour? Any relevant instance would be a miracle. That the Spirit of God works far and wide through heathen lands, we recognise. But we still wait for actual proof that the Pentecostal Gift of God's Spirit does ever become operative except through the ordinances of the Lord. In any case, so clearly is the regular and established order of spiritual experience enunciated by our Lord—"If ye love Me, ye will *keep My commandments*, and I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter . . . even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive"—that one must regard the tendency observed in many quarters which arrogate to themselves the name of "evangelical"—the tendency to exalt the inner light above the ordinances of the Lord—as a disobedient tendency, as one fraught with grave danger to the Faith, and as one that leads ultimately to all manner of extravagance and fanaticism.

The relation of the ordinances of the Lord in the Church to the Pentecostal gift may therefore be defined as an *instrumental* relation. The Holy Ghost employs these ordinances, animates and vivifies them, confers upon them their actual efficacy. They are the forms provided for the Spirit. They are regular modes of spiritual operation. They are the channels in which the Living Water flows. They are the means by which the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, is ministered to the

corporate Church and to the individual soul. And each ordinance, as will appear in the other papers of the Conference, is the special means by which its own appropriate grace is ministered.

Should we inquire further why this general relation exists, why the Spirit chooses these particular instruments by which to work, it may not be easy to reply. We can discern, indeed, a certain fitness in the use of the Word as a means of grace ; though, even in the case of the ministry of the Word, the spiritual effect goes far beyond the apparent adaptation of means to end. We can also discern the appropriateness of prayer and worship to the spiritual blessings granted in response, though the activities of the Holy Ghost in and through prayer are often still more mysterious than the illumination of the Word. But when we come to consider the special benefits conferred through the Sacraments and through ordination, we can but very dimly perceive—so slender seem the means, so transcendent the spiritual consequences—why these precise elements and actions should have been appointed as *instruments* of grace. With regard to all the ordinances of the Church, indeed, and their appointed purposes, we are driven back to find rest for our speculations simply in the will of the Lord. Thus, for instance, does S. Paul explain what he calls “the foolishness of preaching” : “ God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise ; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty ; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught the things that

are, that no flesh should glory in His presence." Just as it is the Divine will, and ultimately the Divine will alone, which in the sequence of things seen and temporal has joined together, through the immanence of His power, natural cause and natural effect, so is it the will of the Lord, and His sovereign will alone, that has joined blessing through the operation of the Holy Ghost to the ordinances provided in His Church. And just as the more disproportionate to the means used does the grace ministered seem, the more clearly do these means demonstrate the presence and might of the Holy Ghost, and the more searchingly do they elicit and test our humility and faith and love and obedience in observing them devoutly, according to the commandment of the Lord. Possible, indeed, it is that did we know the kingdom of grace as intimately as we know the kingdom of nature, the harmony, fitness, and beauty of the adaptation of means to end in the appointed form of Christ's ordinances would manifestly appear to all; and its harmony, fitness, and beauty do gloriously appear in proportion as we make progress in spiritual knowledge and experience. But, inasmuch as our knowledge and experience of things pertaining to the kingdom of heaven are so lamentably defective, we must for the present be content generally to walk by faith, not by sight, and humbly to bow ourselves before that Word of the Master which makes absolute demand upon our unquestioning obedience: "IF YE LOVE ME, YE WILL KEEP MY COMMANDMENTS, AND I WILL PRAY THE FATHER, AND HE SHALL GIVE YOU ANOTHER COMFORTER."

The Relation of the Pentecostal Gift to the Operations of Grace through the Ordinances of the Lord—In the Experience of the Soul.

REV. GEORGE BELL, M.A., MUS.D.

ALTHOUGH the Lord has appointed Ordinances in the Church through which by the Holy Ghost to communicate His benefits, these are not merely mechanical in their operation. "God works not upon but with man"—certainly with man: men must co-operate, must improve the grace given. There is thus an experience of the soul relative to the operation of grace in the bestowal of the Pentecostal Gift.

The initial possibility of such experience in the soul of the Regenerate is itself, however, the fruit of an Operation of Grace. The beginning of Spiritual life is through the act of God not of man. "Ye have not chosen Me," our Lord said, "but I have chosen you." In the day of Baptism first, the free gift of God was represented, sealed and applied to the soul of the elect member of the Body

of Christ : when the Holy Ghost, *Ζωοποιός*, the Lord and Giver of Life, moved over these waters wherein after a mystery we are buried with Christ, and (as when the Lord Jesus stood at Lazarus' tomb) uttered His call, "Come forth"—to newness of life. In that day there was vouchsafed to the baptised the laying down of a foundation upon which by grace the full glories of a sanctified heart and conversation are to be reared by the great Master-BUILDER.

The unmerited mercy of God in Christ is the origin and cause of the divine re-creation of man, by which so much more is given him than the Fall had forfeited. Created at the first in the Image of God, the long work of the Christian Dispensation is his re-creation in Christ Jesus after the same likeness. For this end God has breathed into him anew the Breath of Life. Life is derived always from pre-existing life : Spiritual life which can only derive from one source, the Holy Spirit of God, possesses the unique and singular glory of bringing with it the likeness of its Divine original.

Such life, accordingly, must harmonise in its experience with its august Source. All its consequent phases must consist of farther unfoldings of the divinely planted germ, till this at length attains the full dimensions of a tree that will not wither, neither will cease from yielding fruit (new borne as each stage of its life's progress is reached) unto the praise of the glory of His grace Whose noblest work is in this Re-creation.

To attempt an analysis of the stages through which the soul passes in its experience of the operations of grace :

I. *This experience consists in the consciousness of a new standing before God.*

The work of the Spirit is to convince us of our sin and misery, to enlighten our minds in the knowledge of Christ,¹ and to renew our wills; and thus to enable us to embrace JESUS CHRIST, freely offered to us in the Gospel.²

To apprehend the new relation to God which is granted us in His Son, wholly changes our life's horizon. We see ourselves brought near, no more proscribed as rebels, no more far off as strangers. We are set free from the fetters of sin, are invested with the liberty of the sons of God, are clad in the fair garments of privilege.

To obscure this new beatitude, to blind men's eyes to its reality, is the constant effort of Satan; and in so far as he succeeds, working on that in us which remains alive unto sin, so far the activity of the life in us that is "risen with Christ" is cramped and its development hindered. In so far, however, as he fails, there is a joyful sense of reconciliation to God, of acceptance in the Beloved, and of consequent freedom to seek those things that are above.

II. *The experience of the soul consists in its awakening to the consciousness of a new inward state.*

Old things pass away: the new world which opens out its far distances fixes the soul's gaze and draws its aspiration. There is a change of ideals, of desires,

¹ Acts xxvi. 18: "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified."

² *Shorter Catechism*, Q. 31.

of purposes, of intentions. New conceptions of God, new views of man now dawn upon the spirit of the believer. The love of the Father, as manifested in the Son,—the Word, the Expression of the Father's Image—ever assumes vaster proportions before his mind. As he looks upon himself renewed in Christ, while conscious of many sins and defects, he is enabled still to adore the grace in which he stands and to rejoice in his new creation, so that recognising the Source from which his blessedness springs, he cries : " With Thee is the fountain of life, in Thy light shall we see light."

III. *The experience of the soul consists in the discernment of new and divinely-given powers, never previously possessed.*

These powers are of various kinds. To take a familiar and almost trite example, I would instance the power to pray. It is absent when not acquired of the Spirit. Nothing is more instructive in this connection than the answer of persons—the average man or woman—who have fallen victims to temptation. They are asked if they have prayed to God to save them from it, and the answer, frequently, is a confession of inability to pray. They know not what to pray for as they ought ; nor the way by which to come unto the FATHER. They have not received the power to pray, which is a divine, supernatural gift. Akin to the power to pray is the power to participate in Divine Worship : I mean, in the true and real sense. The mass of people do not at all desire a service which is *worship*. They have but sufficient grace to exhibit a desire for instruction, information about religious things ; which shades down

into a wish for so-called "interesting" sermons, or "intellectual treats," and reaches its lowest point in the success of the semi-secular lecture, and the sensationalism of the charlatan. A service that is worship chiefly or worship only is, on this account, unpopular in the ordinary sense of the term, simply because of the comparative rarity of the power to join in any sustained act of adoration or supplication or thanksgiving. To this cause, I venture to believe, is due the sparse attendance at certain services, especially those held on week-days. For example, it is hardly possible in the present state of religious attainment in Scotland, to gather more than a few together for worship on the Thursday which commemorates the glorious Ascension of our Lord.

But if we had tasted more truly and more deeply of the Heavenly Gift and the powers of the world to come, a love of the exercise of meditation, of participation in the worship of God, would possess and inflame our hearts. The power to fulfil any religious duty however trifling—if such a qualification may be used of any—arises from the same Spirit. When we consider how entirely wonderful a thing is the practice of prayer—so very divine an art—or the practice of any other religious habit, each of which is so completely antagonistic to and so persistently opposed by the world, the flesh, and the devil, we can but recognise, with all due veneration, the supernatural nature of these things, and give laud unto that Spirit Who, with the Father and the Son, together is worshipped and glorified for evermore.

IV. *The experience of the soul consists in its per-*

ception of the Presence of Christ by the Holy Ghost, within its own being.

This is almost a final step in the ladder of attainment. I certainly do not desire to depict for admiration a species of self-conscious Christian. But at the same time if the Christian man is to rise to any true conception of his standing and potential efficiency as a member of the Body of Christ, as the holder of spiritual energies and privileges, he must be possessed by the full assurance of faith in the reality of the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ in himself. And this is by no means incompatible with the greatest self-abasement and the deepest humility.

The ability to perceive the Divine Indweller, to respect His inspirations, to obey His behests, demands, we may well believe, the development in a high degree, of spiritual sensitiveness. This need, again, is provided for in the sacramental ordinances of the LORD. As the foundation of spiritual experience is given in the Sacrament of Baptism, this development is supplied in the frequent use of the most potent means of grace, the Lord's Supper. By the frequent reception of the blessed Feast which He has provided for our "nourishment and growth in grace,"¹ what revival, what power, what exaltation of every spiritual faculty is imparted by the risen, ascended LORD, Who at His table says to every faithful communicant, "I am come that ye might have life, and that ye might have it more abundantly."

¹ *Shorter Catechism.*

The Relation of the Pentecostal Gift to
the Ordinance of the Word: (*a*) The
Holy Scriptures the Oracles of God
committed to the Church.

REV. S. J. RAMSAY SIBBALD, B.D.

THE Holy Spirit is to guide the Church into all the truth. Obviously, therefore, this guidance will have reference to the understanding and use of those Scriptures which contain the revelation of Divine truth. Doubtless it is the Holy Spirit Who, in fulfilment of our Lord's promise, is guiding us, at the present time, towards a fuller understanding and a clearer appreciation of what we mean by the inspiration and authority of Holy Scripture. While there is much in present-day criticism that we cannot but deplore, there is much also, much more indeed, for which we must be profoundly thankful. The Holy Scriptures have, of all books, the least to fear from fair criticism; and the results of critical study, so far as these have been established, have not invalidated the position of those who claim for Holy Scripture a Divine inspiration and a Divine authority.

The task of this paper is twofold—to set forth the

position of the Holy Scriptures as the Oracles of God ; and to maintain that these are committed to the Church now, as to Israel once, as to the steward of the mysteries of God.

1. The question as to the inspiration and authority of Scripture is one which lies behind and largely outwith the sphere of the preacher and minister of the Gospel. To him the Holy Scriptures are like a towering mountain, its summit wreathed in cloud, out of whose granite sides he must quarry material wherewith to build and beautify the streets of the city of God. To him the question is, Does this material serve its purpose? Are the buildings it goes to construct lasting, stable, sure? In other words, do the truths, moral or spiritual, which are drawn from Scripture and applied to the life of men, influence men's lives for good, building up and forming Christian character? It is not when we are at work as builders, but when we turn to the rock itself, and begin to examine its formation, to trace its veins and lines, to seek to determine the age of its various strata, that critical questions arise. There may have been in it, we say, some displacement, violent or gradual, which causes that which was earlier to appear later ; there may have been some upheaval which has crushed into fragments what should have been whole, or fused into unity what originally were separate and independent pieces. Some would go further and say, How do we know that in past ages hands like our own did not lay these huge blocks together, fitting edge to edge with a nicety which deceives us altogether as to the history and production of the whole structure, and

makes us fancy that some superhuman power had been at work?' To these the answer we should give would be, How could they have done it? Artificial methods are not so easily confounded with natural processes; human work can never be mistaken for Divine. What the unprejudiced mind cannot help admitting is the unique grandeur of the Bible; a grandeur which as far exceeds that of any other book or set of documents as the Alps impress us more than the Pyramids.

The unity of the testimony of Holy Scripture is not an imagination, but a fact which lies at the root of all true criticism. To say that its books are human documents, to be studied like other human documents, is to begin with the conclusion. Putting aside minute questions of the exact dates of its different parts [which do not properly come within the scope of this paper], we must see in it a progressive revelation of God in His relation to man. It sets before us, first, God the source of physical life, then, God the source of moral distinctions, then God the source of spiritual life: or, to look at it from the human side, it shows us first, man separated from the rest of creation, then men separated from one another by moral distinctions, then the Church called out of the world; and finally the complete detachment of the Church from the world, and her unending union as the Bride of Christ with the glorified Lord,—the progress of man, in short, from the earthly to the heavenly. That is a unique testimony, which purely historical criticism cannot affect. It would be difficult for one man, in the book of a lifetime, to set forth such a progression; it would be impossible

for different men, in different ages, amid different surroundings, and with different facts to record, to achieve such a unity, unless in all we see the work of the "one and self-same Spirit."

The question then arises, What becomes of the progressiveness of this revelation and the unity of this testimony if, in accordance with the dicta of modern criticism, we must readjust the order of the divisions of the Old Testament, for instance, hitherto accepted? Must we accept the aphorism of Reuss, as summing up the resultant of critical investigation of the Old Testament, "The prophets are older than the Law, and the Psalms younger than both"? If we do accept it, how does it affect the revelation which we profess to find in the Old Testament? Without subscribing for a moment to a conclusion so doubtfully established, we may yet point out that though it were accepted it would not affect prejudicially either the progressiveness of the revelation or the unity of the testimony. It could mean no more than that in the form in which they have come down to us, the various parts require rearrangement as to chronological order. The classification of the Old Testament writings as Law, History, Prophecy, and Poetry, far-reaching as it is, is superficial as compared with the deeper unity which pervades them. It would not, for example, be untrue to say that the Old Testament is all prophecy, prophecy expressed, indeed, in different forms. The Law is essentially prophetic, if we understand prophecy as the revelation of the Divine will,—it is prophecy expressed in moral and ritual precepts; the History is prophetic,—prophetic interpretation of national

movements and social or political life ; the prophetic books are prophecy, not merely on the narrower ground of their predictions, but also on the wider ground of expressing and manifesting with greater clearness those spiritual principles which are latent in Law and History ; the Poetical Books are prophecy,—the expression of the Divine will in the inner life of the soul. It might even be said that the New Testament carries out this idea ; the Gospels are prophetic in this highest sense, inasmuch as they are the revelation of God in Him in Whom “ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily ” ; the Epistles are also prophetic, as the work of those who with the prophets form the foundation on which rises the holy temple of the fellowship of saints ; and the Apocalypse is prophetic, again not merely in the narrower predictive sense, but in the wider sense of exhibiting the vindication of the spiritual principles which underlie the whole manifestation of God in Holy Scripture. If the writers of Scripture were mere annalists, criticism would endanger the received view regarding it ; but they are much more than that, they are historians, prophets, philosophers, poets ; seeking and seeing behind the event the cause, and, standing upon their watchtowers, looking out upon a wider field than does the chronicler who occupies the lower ground. Questions of date, authorship, and minute exactness in depicting contemporary events, however they are settled, cannot touch the fact that in the Scriptures as a whole we have a great revelation of God in His relation to man ; a progressive revelation, which truly makes God known to be One, Faithful, Merciful, and Just. When to this we add that

ultimate test of true inspiration,—“the demonstration of the Spirit and of power,” an experience to which millions can testify, we recognise in the Scriptures a Voice that speaks with human tongues and in human speech the words “which are spirit and which are life.”

2. Are these oracles, then, cast upon the world, to make their way and find acceptance on their own merits—the greatness and value of their revelation and their testimony to Divine truth? Scripture itself answers as regards the Old Testament, affirming that “the Oracles of God were committed to the Jews” (Romans iii. 2). The significance of this is obvious when we remember that the word used means not merely the giving or delivering of these oracles, but the “entrusting” of them, as a sacred charge, to the chosen people. It implies the use and preservation of them as a trust for the benefit—we cannot doubt such was the divine purpose—of humanity at large. In pursuance of this charge, Judaism claimed and exercised the power of fixing the Canon, of transcribing, and, above all, of interpreting and teaching the Scripture.

Has the Church inherited this charge and succeeded to this trust? It needs but a slight acquaintance with Apostolic and Post-Apostolic literature to lead us to see that the early Church claimed to exercise the same powers in regard to determining the Canon, not only of the Old but also of the New Testament, and of transcribing and interpreting, whether by definition of doctrine, or by exposition, both the books of the Old Testament and the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles. These powers, so far as not already exhaustively exercised,

we believe still to reside in the Church, and to be essential to her due influence on the world.

When we examine the grounds of the claim which the Church makes to exercise this stewardship, we find it to rest primarily on the fact that the revelation enshrined in Holy Scripture is a revelation which has the Person and Work of Christ as its centre and subject. The Old Testament prepares for Christ, not only by its types and foreshadowings, but by its gradual unfolding of principles of which He is the living personification. The New Testament brings the full revelation to which the Old leads up, and presents the work of Christ as performed by Himself in Person, and as carried on by Him through His Holy Spirit in and by the Church. Holy Scripture enshrines the record of God's manifestation of Himself, and the Church is to be the exponent of that record, because she was founded as a witness, a perpetual witness, to the facts and principles therein contained. "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts i. 8). She was for years the depositary and preserver of the words and deeds of Christ, before the record of these assumed written forms; and as a witness to Him, and therefore to what is written about Him, in Gospel or Epistle, she exercised, as herself enlightened by the inspiring Spirit and guided by His testimony, her right to say what were, and what were not, Canonical Scriptures. The judgment then formulated as to the limits of the Canon of Scripture stands approved in our faith to-day, for our preaching and our standards profess to be authoritative only

in so far as they are in accordance with what we find in the written Word of God. "Without this Word neither Church, Council, or Decree can establish any point touching salvation" (*Confession of Faith*, used in English Congregation at Geneva, received and approved by the Church of Scotland). "If any man will note in this our Confession, any Article or Sentence repugning to God's Holy Word, that it would please him, of his gentleness, and for Christian charity's sake, admonish us of the same in writing; and we upon our honours and fidelity, do promise unto him satisfaction from the mouth of God (that is from His Holy Scriptures) or else Reformation of that which he shall prove to be amiss" (*Confession*, 1560). "In all controversies of religion the Church is finally to appeal to them," *i.e.* to the Old Testament in Hebrew, the New Testament in Greek; "The Supreme Judge, by which all controversies of Religion are to be determined, and all Decrees of Councils, Opinions of ancient writers, Doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in Whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture" (*Westminster Confession*, I. viii. x.).

Has the Church, then, as guardian, interpreter, and expounder of the Holy Scriptures, any positive teaching to give us regarding them, or is she satisfied with merely rebutting the negative criticism by which they are assailed? While the divided state of Christendom, with the consequently weakened authority of the Church, renders an answer to this question difficult, we have to face a real danger if we content ourselves with simply repelling

attack, and give an uncertain sound on the great problems to which criticism has addressed itself. "How are we to regard the Scriptures?" is a question that demands a categorical answer; and the unhesitating reply of the Church to-day, critical questions notwithstanding, is "In them is contained the Word of God."¹ There is also general agreement that this Divine Word has assumed the form which is presented in Holy Scripture by a process of Inspiration; and that in this process the Holy Spirit, while allowing freedom to the literary and critical faculties of the writers, has guided them to set forth the revelation of Divine truth. In these Scriptures the Church finds a Rule of Faith and a Rule of Life, for herself as a body and for the individual Christian; a Rule of Faith which has been summarised by the Church with wonderful completeness in the Oecumenical Creed; a Rule of Life which, though crystallised into form on Mount Sinai, and restated in our Lord's teaching, is, in essence, latent in every book of the Bible: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself." Founding her teaching and preaching on the Holy Scriptures, the Church takes us to these as a trustworthy standard of Christian faith and practice; and her answer to those who point to the difficulties and discrepancies which criticism has brought to light is that she daily finds this Word of God to be a living Word, "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

¹ *Shorter Catechism*, Q. 2.

The Relation of the Pentecostal Gift to
the Ordinance of the Word : (b) The
Church's Stewardship of the Holy
Scriptures.

REV. H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A.

THE Holy Scriptures are a Record of Revelation, as the Holy Ghost has spoken to men chosen,—to prophets in the old time, to apostles in the present age.

The Church of God has received them in two forms—by inheritance from Israel and by direct delivery from those men to whom the Lord entrusted the building of the Church upon Him, the one Foundation. The Church keeps them, and is kept by them. She is Steward of this charge—to preserve the Sacred Scriptures pure and unadulterated—to make them the test of her rule of faith and morals, guided always by the standard of “it is written”—to open up their contents to her own children, showing always that what she teaches, they prove as the Apostolic Gospel—and to promulgate them to the world as the law of liberty and as containing the very Word of God.

But her attitude to the Scriptures is not to be only that of one who guards a treasure, or as if she held them in her possession; she must also be holden of them—submissive to the mind of God in them—raising beside them no co-ordinate authority of her own, but rather so guiding herself by them and so conforming herself to them, that their authority be hers in every word of her instruction and in every act of her ministry.

There is no safety for her in teaching, apart from that which is written—no certainty in ordaining what shall be done, except her rule bear the test of appeal to that which is written. Only by the use of that standard can the Church be confident with herself that she is keeping the faith and walking in the old paths—only so can she command what she teaches, and commend what she ordains, to the conscience of the flock of God, as assuredly the way appointed and the truth revealed. This standard must be constantly in her hand, a measure for all things in the Lord's House; and this word "It is written" constantly upon her lips, for the confirmation of her whole instruction.

It is nothing to the purpose, as against this sure principle, to point out that the Church necessarily lived and taught for a generation before the specifically Christian Scriptures were in existence, or were canonised; or to insist on the pregnant references in the New Testament itself to the traditions of the apostles and the oral teaching delivered by them. For that generation, the place now occupied by the New Testament Scriptures as a standard of teaching and practice was occupied by the apostles them-

selves, the living depositaries of Revelation and authority, the Twelve Foundations of the City of God, the new Jerusalem. For all later generations, the place then occupied by the living voice of the Apostolate, as the ruling test of all teaching and government, is occupied by those Scriptures which they, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, addressed to the Church. Their tradition expressed itself in these—became permanent in this form. The faith once delivered to them—which they personally for their own generation taught and spoke—that same faith they also delivered “written” both to their own generation and to us.

The Apostolic Scriptures in no necessary particular differ from the Apostolic preaching; and in nothing essential come short of it. The New Testament omits confirmation of no point of the Apostolic creed. By the very nature of the case, apart from all question of special direction and of Divine inspiration, the matters of which they were careful to write, were those matters which are of main concern: the things which are needful to a true faith and a right order. We keep the tradition of St. John when we hearken to his Gospel and his Epistles. We keep the tradition of St. Peter when we hearken to the Epistles of St. Peter and to the Gospel of St. Mark, his disciple and interpreter. We keep the tradition of St. Paul when we keep the doctrine and precept of his twelve great letters, and of the Gospel delivered to us by his friend and pupil St. Luke. Nothing that is needful to faith—nothing that is essential to life—is forgotten in these, or left to be otherwise transmitted. That good

thing which was committed to them, they took care to deliver to us also. Here in their writings we have the image of the faith and life of the Church as it believed and as it lived under the Apostolic direction itself; it is enough if we become imitators of them, and so walk as we have them for example.

I would not seem to undervalue any light that can be thrown upon that first age, from other sources by scholarship or criticism—we may thereby the better understand the Scriptures themselves, and enter into the meaning of their expressions and allusions. Some things of Apostolic custom and method may be gathered, or explained, from a knowledge of the generations immediately succeeding; the more we know of these, the better we will comprehend the whole. Nothing, however, of the Faith, nothing of the Christian code of life, remains to be discovered from such sources, or can be argued from them apart from the Scriptures. For everything in that field the Church can be on safe ground only with that word, "It is written."

Apart from this rule the Church has never walked safely or straight. We all know how the assertion of a tradition of the Apostles, unrecorded yet discoverable from the general mind of the Church apart from the test of Scripture, has led one part of the Church into strange paths, into novelties, into doctrines unknown to the earlier centuries, and practices foreign to the fundamental conceptions of the Gospel. Romanism has become what it is, mainly by its wrong attitude to the written Word. Bible in hand, and submissive to

the appeal to Scripture, that system could not have arisen, and could not have grown to its unlikeness to Apostolic Christianity. Once admit a tradition which is not referable to Scripture, measurable by Scripture, to stand or fall by its proof from Scripture; and there is no security for faith or practice.

But farther, the Church is never safe to go on teaching even the Faith except by the Scriptures and from them, under constant appeal to their confirmation and recourse to them for their inspiration of her living word. Instructed unto the Kingdom of God, she must out of that treasury bring forth things new and old—always the old things (there is no fresh revelation now possible, since God has appeared to us in the face of Jesus Christ)—but always these things new in their application to the day and the man—new in application to the generation in question, to circumstances not before illustrated, and lives unlike any that have been. The Church has to keep the faith—as once delivered to her; but to keep it by the Scriptures; and except by use of Scripture, as ever fresh to her, she cannot. Else without ceasing to be orthodox, she may cease to be vital; she may cease to observe the proportion of the faith and the power of the truth.

It is of this peril that the Greek Church perhaps gives a certain warning. It has added no strange article to the Creed. It has kept the faith, and has laboured and suffered and had patience, and has not fainted. Yet not even its sufferings, not even its martyrdoms, have sufficed to maintain it in the quickness and energy and vitality which exist, where

the Holy Scripture is the constant food and spur of the Christian life. It becomes us to speak gently and reverently of brethren who have endured so steadfastly and have erred so little. The Eastern Churches have not set themselves to shut up the Scriptures. They have not hated that men should know these. They have not set any authority against them. Nevertheless their course illustrates, how, apart from constant contact with the record, teaching will become mechanical; how some aspects of truth will be neglected and some points unduly emphasised; how, without any inculcation of error or novelty, the face of Christianity may be distorted or concealed, unless it hold itself true to itself by a constant looking into that mirror of the truth, which is in the Law of the Lord.

It is the singular favour of God to ourselves in these reformed Churches that the Holy Scriptures hold among us something that approaches to their due place. Therein is the secret of the activity and reasonableness which exists in the religion of the reformed Churches—of its power on character, and its force with the individual. Our weakness has lain, not (as some would say) in our open possession and constant handling of the Word, but in our inadequate apprehension of its scope, our partial submission to its authority, our preference for particular aspects of its contents—here this, and there that aspect—our want of comprehensive grasp of its fulness. It is Bacon, I think, who has said that all sectaries are men of one text. Our divisions mark the point of weakness.

Nevertheless, there is hope always—everything is

possible—where the Scriptures are searched and are revered, and are accepted as the ultimate standard of appeal. Every past revival in the Church has been Scriptural—out of the impulse of “that which is written”; and every past reformation has originated from Scripture, as men read and judged their ways by that which is written; and has wrought for good exactly in measure as it was guided by Scripture. If there be revival or reform in store for us to-day (as we with one voice confess the need, and as the Church of Scotland has set itself to effect),¹ that will be true and lasting, in measure as it is Scriptural—not of policy, or to catch the humour of the time, but as it shall prove itself an earnest effort to conform to a Heavenly ideal, as revealed to us.

There is no lack among us of interest in the Scriptures. Never was there so large a Biblical literature current as to-day. But there is often a wrong attitude to Scripture—as if Holy Scripture were a record only, and not an authority; as if we had to ask only how it came to be written—not what is its teaching and precept. As among Christian men, and in the Church of God, that is a false attitude. For the world, as among scholars, as with hostile or indifferent critics, as in discussion with men who decline the faith, we must reason on common ground with them—we must discuss Holy Scripture itself as History and Literature. Among ourselves, as Christian men, as in the Church of God, we confess its

¹ These words were originally written in A.D. 1896, before the dismissal of the Church Reform Committee appointed by the General Assembly in May of that year.

authority—we receive it as a Divine gift; we seek to it as the test of doctrine; we bow to it as the rule. We have received the Faith; and in the Holy Scripture we find its exposition, and we accept its demonstration.

The Relation of the Pentecostal Gift to
the Ordinance of the Word : (b) The
Spiritual Conditions of Effective Preach-
ing, in the Ministry and in the Flock.

REV. J. R. M'CALLUM, B.D.

WHAT is "effective preaching"? The answer depends on the kind of effect we desire to secure. If we were to ask some members of our congregations to tell us what in their opinion are the characteristics of a good sermon, we might find their ideal to be fine literary work, or an attempt to grapple with the deep problems of religion and life, or heart-moving pathos, or oratory sustained by the art of the elocutionist. None of these produce the effects which the Gospel of God is designed to achieve. That only is a "good sermon," which does good—awakening the sinful, restoring the fallen, encouraging the faint, comforting the tried, edifying the believing. Effective preaching is such as is described by S. Paul:¹ "Our gospel came to you not in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance." "Ye

¹ Thes. i. 5, 9, 10.

turned from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for His Son from heaven."

To bring about an effect of this kind is the great end for which the Saviour gave His life, and gives His Spirit. How, then, can the preacher and the hearers best co-operate with the Spirit of Christ in producing this blessed result?

It is possible here to indicate in answer only a few of the conditions on the part of each of these respectively, which general observation leads us to think underlie the effective work of the Holy Spirit in human hearts.

First, as to the preacher, what conditions are necessary in him?

Some people think that if we only had earnest preachers (of a particular type of earnestness) the revival of the Church would follow as a matter of course. But while much depends on the minister, more depends on his message. The Holy Spirit, God's Agent in quickening and sanctifying souls, can use only God's message. That message the preacher who is to edify the flock of God must declare. One of the things that distinguished our Lord from all other teachers, was that He never gave an opinion—He stated absolute truth. Among His servants, likewise, those will be most effective who come nearest His example. There is a definite peace between God and man, the terms of which the preacher must proclaim. The way of the world's salvation by the Crucified, Risen, Ever Active Saviour has been revealed; and he who makes it his business to declare that, can depend on the co-operation of the Holy Spirit Who ever glorifies Christ.

There is, in these times, a demand made upon the preacher for a multitude of things—for originality, for ability to discourse on speculative philosophy, on pure ethics, on the latest theories of Biblical Criticism. If he obey these demands, he will be apt to forget that His master sent him with a definite message, the word of Salvation. That he may illustrate, may present in fresh lights, may apply to new conditions of life and society ; but what he reiterates must be the Gospel of the grace of God as the only means by which the Holy Spirit to the end of time enlightens and saves the people of the Lord.

Again, the preacher must have proved the value and blessedness of the message which he brings. He preaches first to himself. Is this pardon which he proclaims enjoyed by himself? Is this grace, of which he speaks as sufficient for every need, a reality of his own experience? Is this peace of mind midst the activities and difficulties of life, on the serenity of which he descants, possessed by him? These he proclaims—is he himself blessed by them? There is a vast difference between speaking the things one knows, and reciting what one has been taught. The influence of the former is that of a witness who knows whereof he affirms ; the latter has only the force of hearsay.

There is still, I believe, in every congregation, the power to try the spirits, to discern the man of God, to perceive whether the doctrines preached are, or are not, the very strength and joy of the preacher's own life. "No one can get up Christianity so as to deceive a Christian. Theology, of course, may be got up, and Biblical Criticism ; but the religion of the heart

cannot be feigned." The preacher may be orthodox, but the Holy Spirit seeks in His agent more than orthodoxy. He seeks the orthodoxy that is alive in the fresh experience of the living soul. The Holy Spirit, who yearns over each life with a passionate longing to possess it for Christ, must be the preacher's model. Words of truth must be upon his lips—but of truth proved in the hidden life of his own soul, and ever spoken with manifest longing to win men for Christ. He who so preaches may expect his words to go home to hearts "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power."¹

Yet sometimes even such a preacher may not succeed. Our Lord did not always succeed. The Apostle Paul had to turn away from those who judged themselves unworthy of eternal life.² The old prophet gave the note of many a preacher's cry: "Who hath believed our report, to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?"³ Yet while the blame for the fruitlessness of his preaching may rest elsewhere, the preacher must not be too ready to exonerate himself. Everything in his life and speech that lessens the confidence of the people in him as a faithful and true exponent of the divine will, raises up a barrier against his preaching, however true and earnest. Everyone recognises the baneful influence of inconsistent conduct; other things there are, besides, which hinder effective ministry of the Word. We live in a period of transition. New views of the authorship, composition, and even of the aims of the books of Scripture are being promulgated. Efforts are being made in many quarters to improve the

¹ I Cor. ii. 4.² Acts xiii. 46.³ Is. liii. 1.

ritual of the Church, and thereby to render her services more seemly and more fully expressive of the elements of worship. Sometimes words and phrases are used which to the mind of the people seem to suggest the revival of dogmas which they consider superstitions from which they have been happily delivered. There is need for the greatest care in entering on any of these matters, lest confidence in preachers as honest and trustworthy guides in the way of truth be impaired, and their message rendered impotent. It is ever the minister's duty to consider if the new teaching he desires to give, the new ceremonial he purposes to introduce, will interfere with or will further his effectiveness in deepening the spiritual life of his people. Let him beware lest in any way he should create such distrust of his intentions and thereby of his message, as will render the work of the Holy Spirit in the minds and hearts of his hearers increasingly difficult. How easy it is by our foolishness, even by the indulgence of our idiosyncrasies, to hinder the work of the Holy Spirit!

"The hand of the Lord is a very fine hand; take heed how you interfere with His work." So said a venerable minister to a body of young men who had just received the licence of our Church to preach. I have known one peevish, ill-tempered and unreasonable paragraph of an otherwise most suitable discourse not only neutralise all its good effects, but positively stop for the time the manifestation of God's gracious working in a congregation.

Yet the witness of the Church has ever been that sinners are converted, and saints edified,—not so much by learned, or clever, or eloquent preaching—

though may God grant us such sanctified gifts!—as by the utterances of men who, themselves walking with God, speak out of the fulness of their experience of His grace, and whose holy self-sacrificing lives confirm their teaching.

Secondly, as to the hearers. That hearers are not converted, that believers do not yield themselves a living sacrifice unto God, may not be the preacher's fault. Even our Lord said to Nicodemus,¹ "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness." Even of Him it is written that when He came amongst His own countrymen "He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief."² Yet no one doubts that the message of God was rightly delivered by Him Who received not the Spirit by measure. How then is it that a congregation may receive little or no blessing from the preaching even of faithful men?

One of the most successful of "revival" preachers in America was President Finney of Oberlin College. It was his belief that the Holy Spirit would not use his preaching unless in the congregation he addressed certain conditions existed. Consequently it was his custom to begin his missions in a way decidedly unexpected. He would ask how the congregation were supporting the work of God; how they had fulfilled their engagements to the ministry; if there were any feuds among them, any Christians living in estrangement from each other. These or similar questions he would put; and only when he had set the finances right, when he had reconciled those at enmity, when

¹ S. John iii. 11.

² S. Matt. xiii. 58.

he had joined all in the bonds of love and honesty before God, would he begin his Evangelistic Mission in any hope of the Presence and Manifestation of the Holy Ghost.

The wonderful results of his Mission preaching show how the Spirit's work in the Congregation is hindered by the dishonourable, unhallowed, and unbrotherly feeling which sometimes reigns there. The Gospel, however fully, however earnestly preached, never comes in power to a congregation where the spirit of brotherhood, of fellowship, of good will does not prevail. So are we reminded by S. James:¹ "Where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work."

The bitterness which can characterise theological controversy, and the fierceness with which congregational quarrels are waged, have long been proverbial. Till the end of time, of course, Christians will look at things from different points of view, and will come to different conclusions. But where is the SPIRIT of JESUS in them, if they allow the fact of a difference in opinion to be the occasion of even temporary alienation and dispeace? "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake has forgiven you."² Then will the Word of God come with power, when there is beforehand the preparation of peace.

Such must be the conditions of congregational life, if preaching is to obtain its due result. There are characteristics of individual hearers also, which deter-

¹ S. James iii. 16.

² Eph. iv. 31, 32.

mine as regards them the effectiveness of preaching. There must be, for instance, on their part, open-mindedness, for prejudice hinders the operation of the Spirit by the word. We may be thankful that prejudice is not general as against most of the truth which the Holy Ghost would teach. There sometimes is a prejudice against the preacher, which neutralises his message however needful to be heard. This he may not be able to remove, when it once exists, but he must earnestly pray to be so guided as not to create it.

But while there is little prejudice against the Gospel as a whole, some parts and aspects of it meet with much. How often, for example, has the doctrine of "Justification by Faith" failed to win the intellect, just because natural pride of heart had cultivated a spirit of contempt for this way of grace.

What prejudice again has often to be removed before Scriptural views on such subjects as the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments, Christian Giving, Fasting, Missions, are permitted to have their rightful acceptance. Doubts and difficulties do not hinder the Spirit in His commendation of the Word so much as prejudice does. He has, indeed, a peculiarly gentle ministry towards the doubting. For the presence of doubt reveals often thoughtfulness, and shows a mind dreading to accept a false object of faith. Difficulties do not occur to the unthinking. The vessels of the greatest beauty and usefulness in the house of the Lord are those whose tears and groans and anguish of spirit reveal a mind capable of entering deeply into the apprehension of the message of God. Doubt gives way before evidence, but

prejudice becomes more bitter, more inveterate in the face of the clearest light. Was it not so with many of the Jews during the earthly ministry of our Lord? Increasing light only intensified their irreconcilable opposition.

To have an open mind is, then, greatly necessary if the heart is to find the Word preached precious to it. For this disposition the Bereans were commended by S. Luke:¹ "These were more noble than they of Thessalonica in that they received the Word in all readiness of mind." Where this temper is found, souls are led in light, and nourished by truth.

Lastly, it is obvious that some measure of Faith is a condition of all progress in the spiritual life. One should pray to be disposed to receive the truth, and to be delivered from hesitation in acting upon it. For, after all, every step in Christian experience is a fresh venture upon the truth and goodness of God declared in some promise of His Word, and proved only as we trust it and try it in the work of life.

Faith shows itself in the congregation by belief in each Ordinance of God. Is that Ordinance one of Sacraments? They are used faithfully with humble hope of divine blessing. Is it Public Worship? That is taken advantage of steadily, in the belief that we can both give and get therein as we cannot elsewhere. Is it the Preaching of the Word? Then that is listened to as a message specially sent by God to those who hear.

And he who uses these Ordinances with faith expects much through their means. He comes to

¹ Acts xvii. 11.

these wells of living water in the expectation of blessed refreshment. Expectancy is the fruit of faith that the ordinance of God is laden with blessing. I am sure that to the expectant the Holy Spirit ever makes the Word full of living power. "My soul, wait thou only upon God, for my expectation is from Him."¹

Some of the conditions on the part of preacher and hearer that make for effective preaching have now been mentioned. How shall we judge that the preaching has actually attained the Holy Spirit's purposes?

Let no one think that the Gospel has accomplished its work merely because the sermon has been listened to with rapt attention, or with evident admiration. The spell cast by the orator must not be mistaken for the wooing and working of the Holy Ghost.

If the sermon has been good in the sense that through it the Divine Spirit has touched our spirits, one of the most common signs is a feeling of dissatisfaction. Louis XIV. did not know that he was declaring the presence of the Spirit in his own soul when he paid his famous compliment to Massillon: "I have heard more than one great orator in my chapel, and was very well satisfied with them; but, whenever I hear you, I am always dissatisfied with myself." Similar was the effect on those who, at the close of S. Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, cried, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"²

In self-condemnation, in tears of penitence, in vows of new obedience, in awakened interest in the work of God, in humble use of the means of grace which

¹ Ps. lxii. 5.

² Acts ii. 37.

equip for living and acting wisely and well,—in these effects shall be seen the operation of the Lord through that Gospel, which, spoken in the faith of its divine power, and received in the hope of divine blessing, is still found by preacher and hearer to be “the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth.”¹

¹ Rom. i. 16.

The Pentecostal Gift in relation to Prayer as a Divine Activity : (a) In Corporate Ministry.

REV. H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A.

THE corporate ministry of the flock of God before the Father is a mode of the intercession of our Lord; for the Church is the creation and habitation of His Spirit. It is His body, inasmuch as it is vitalised by His soul, informed by His mind, and directed by His will to acts which are proper to Himself, and which it falls to the Church to perform, only because the life of the Church is actuated through the Holy Ghost by Christ, Who in the midst of the Church praises God.¹ The presence of Christ in the Church which all Christians confess must not be interpreted to mean that by an ethical process the Church is permeated by His teaching, and exhibits His temper: it means the transmission to the Church through the Divine Spirit, as mediated by Christ, of the actual energy of that humanity which is taken into the Godhead. It means an objective extension of the personal consciousness and volition of the ascended Son of Man—an actual presence of His complete

¹ Heb. ii. 12.

life, correlating to Himself and to each other the individual human personalities which this Divine-human vitality seizes and assimilates to form of them for itself an organism—His Body. It is the distinctive property of life so to appropriate and differentiate and organise the material to be the vehicle of its proper activity. Life is everywhere antecedent to form, and constructs for itself from surrounding matter the body which the Divine thought has prepared for it. The building together of the living temple by the life from on high follows the analogy of the growth of our own frame—which is built up, cell by cell, each cell being a living and individual thing, in multitude which no man can number; yet their multitude so ordered together as to become one body for one central life—that of the man. The Church is a true organism, of which we are, as it were, the single cells; the central and unifying life being that of Christ by the Pentecostal Spirit.

There is not infrequent among us a habit of understanding the spiritual as equivalent to the metaphorical, or as the antithesis of the actual; as though spirit were the one thing which may never be incarnate; which, if it take to itself substance and body, would lose thereby its essential character and cease to be spirit. Spiritual verities are, in these days, the equivalent of pious imaginations—if sufficiently pious, it does not matter how imaginary; and a “spiritually-minded” person (the phrase is common) appears to be one so pious that if his conceptions are subjectively edifying, he may be indifferent to their basis in fact. There is some need perhaps to protest for the

objective in religion—to assert incarnation of the spiritual as a principle of Christianity; and to recognise the literalness of the projection of the Divine Life, since Pentecost, into humanity, to assimilate from that rude protoplasm an organism for itself. It is in no sense a figure of speech which our Lord uses when He predicts, as the result of Pentecost, a vital communion between Himself and us, “Ye in Me, and I in you,”¹ or prays that “they may be perfected into one thing.”² It is no figure or metaphor or parable, this vital incorporation of the believer into a new whole which Christ permeates—this extension of Himself into the consecrated fellowship which He severs out of the world by informing it with His life. Parable serves to illustrate truth; this, on the contrary, is the truth which parable and figure are employed to illustrate. The comparison to a vine is a figure, the comparison to the human body is a figure; but the organic relation of the Church to Christ as a consequence of His mediation of the Holy Ghost to us is no figure; His appropriation of the human to be the locus of His presence and the element of His continued activity in the world which He saves, is no figure: this, on the contrary, is the fact which He labours, now by simile and now by literal statement, to fasten in our minds.

Our Lord, then, fulfils the ends of His Incarnation in both spheres of His activity, the Heavenly places and this world—there in that body in which He is ascended and glorified, and here in His body, the Church, one mind and one will fulfilling the same

¹ S. John xiv. 20.

² S. John xvii. 23: *τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν.*

acts there and here. There is in Christ a perfect answer to the will of the Father, Who seeks worshippers, and desires to be entreated of us. In Heaven this answer is found in our Lord's personal intercession; on earth it is found in the response of the Spirit of Christ, through the corporate ministrations of the Church before God. Imperfectly as in many respects the mind of Christ may be expressed, because imperfectly realised, by the Church—slack and stinted as may be the measure of her obedience to Christ's impulse by the Spirit of supplication, the expression and the activity of prayer, so far as attained, are not ours but His. It is Christ Who in the midst of the Church intercedes: doing the will of God, as in heaven, so in earth.

It is the recognition of this which should commend to our reverence rather than to our criticism whatever it is possible to recognise as a result in the Church's life of the travail of Christ's Spirit in her. Those heart-searchings, for example, on the subject of schism and unity which at present torment the Christian conscience, will command from us attention and patient following to their end, in proportion as we perceive in them the complaint of a suffering Christ, wounded in the house of His friends—grieved in the Spirit because we impose upon Him conditions under which, as we have ourselves come to confess, His mission by the Church to the world cannot attain its end. It is the sorrow of Christ's soul which is troubling us; if we know this, we will be the less inclined to silence the wakening scruples which our divisions create. So again the poor efforts of the Church for a wider Evangelism gain a new

sacredness, if we see in them Christ's effort to speak to His own among the Nations—those other sheep whom He has and whom also He must bring: to speak to them by our half-frozen lips and to reach them by our half-paralytic feet. If we see behind such movements the living Christ contending with our preoccupation and indifference to our calling, they will touch us as they have not done.

And so of prayer.—To see the Church's ministry of prayer as it is in the Spirit and in the truth is to see—not, as the world sees, a handful out of the careless thousands of our streets gathering to repeat hackneyed petitions and threadbare hymns—it is to recognise our Lord, returned in the Spirit and clothing Himself in this flesh of ours, which also is His though it is not yet brought to the likeness of His glory—taking it, bringing it, coming in it to the Father, and speaking by it in supplications and prayers and thanksgivings and intercessions. Where the two or three are gathered together in His Name (not *taking* His Name in vain) there is Christ: neither in figure nor metaphor, but in the substantive fact that He is related to their fellowship by an extension of the sphere of His personal consciousness and volitional activity, which His mediation of the Divine Spirit renders possible; as the brain is related by the outgoing and returning nerve current to the limbs and organs of a man's body. The prayer "in Christ's Name" (I do not stop to analyse that pregnant phrase, or to consider all the conditions which it presupposes) is, in the direct sense of the words, a Divine activity. To the vision of Heaven, it is not we who pray; it is Christ Who kneels before

13 the Father, and we are but the knees by which His Holy Body touches this gross earth. It is Christ Who worships and presents Himself, the only sacrifice: we in Him, and He in us, perfected into one thing.

In this doubtless, as in all, the mind of Christ, although we have that mind, finds in us an imperfect organ. We who are quickened in the Spirit are being also transformed in the fashion of our thoughts;¹ but not every thought, even in prayer, is as yet brought into captivity to Him. The Spirit helps our infirmity, He does not abolish it. We know not what to pray for as we ought; but the Spirit Himself pleads for us by our own lips—with groanings to which we can give no adequate interpretation nor any full utterance; yet He that searches the hearts—God who hears our stammering as one listens to the broken words of an invalid or child and gathers their sense—He knows the mind of the Spirit: knows, not only what we have said, but what Christ desired by our means to say. For the Spirit intercedes according to the will of God; and shall not God understand? The sense of infinite failure, the impatience with our own inadequacy in prayer, must not blind us to the marvel of grace which associates us with our Divine Head in the offering of the sacrifice, the fruit of our lips, with which God is well pleased.²

Nor must this consciousness of inadequacy obscure our faith in the efficacy of our intercession, which is assured of result because it is a mode of our Lord's intercession. If we ask anything according to the will of God, we know that we have our petition; and the Spirit maketh intercession

¹ Rom. xii. 2, Ephes. iv. 23.

² Heb. xiii. 15.

for the saints (it is concerning our prayers that it is written) according to the will of God. The prayer of the individual, giving voice as it does to the thought of Christ as but that one soul interprets it, can never perhaps reach the same confidence of conformity to the Divine intention as may attach to the pondered and sifted petitions to which the multitudinous and age-long experience of the corporate Church has been disciplined and has learned to discipline its utterance. Of one prayer we know that it prevails, for it is indeed the Lord's; and Him the Father hears always. "Our Father"—it is Christ who says this with us, not ashamed to call us brethren.

In our Lord's parting discourse to the Twelve, the doctrine of the vital inherence of the Church in Himself as the archetypal Vine is the direct sequence of His exposition of the doctrine and promise of the Paraclete. The life which is one in Christ and in us is there presented as the result of the sending of the Spirit: and the immediate inference is the consequent certainty to us of prevaience in prayer: "I am the Vine; ye are the branches. He that abideth in Me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for apart from Me ye can do nothing. . . . If ye abide in Me and My word abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." The life of the branch in the life of the vine is the secret of all fruit-bearing, and the secret of this fruit of worship, which the Father, the Husbandman, comes seeking. Promise waits it, because it is an expression of a life which is that of the ever-accepted Son.

This vision of the Church's ministry before God as

N
rather ministered by Christ through us than by us through Christ, should be, and will be if we have it, the safeguard and attraction of worship. The safeguard is obvious. We may well take heed what words we put in the mouth of our Lord, or what petitions we bring in His Name. There is no care or reverence of choice, however great, no submission of every thought to His mind, which can in this regard seem adequate.

It is perhaps in the act of Intercession, the typical and supreme form of Christian prayer, that such care and submission are most requisite. For intercession is not, as sometimes would seem to be thought, an urging of human desire upon the Divine attention ; it is not a conflict of our will with that of God, nor an effort to change the current of the Eternal purpose. This will be evident if we consider that to intercede is the distinctive office of Christ, Who is the express Image of the Father with Whom He intercedes, and to Whom He is constantly offered in perfectness of delight in the Father's will. Intercession is the expression of the Divine will. It is the endeavour to set out before God the fulness of His own intention ; which lingers of accomplishment until it has gained our conformity, until it is put in our mind and written in our heart—until God sees it reflected back from us to Him as comprehended and loved, His will become our prayer. Then the Spirit rejoices in us ; for "His groaning" is to find utterance in Earth as in Heaven for the mind of Christ, teaching us to pray for all that the Father purposes in Christ. It is therefore in knowledge of the mind of Christ, as identical with

the purpose of the Father, that our intercession must find both its liberty and its limitation—both its self-restraint and its scope. It may utter all that it knows of the travail of Christ's soul. It may say after Him whatever it knows that He says, as He pleads before the Mercy Seat. It may spread itself wide as the shelter which He throws over His own, and far as the hope in which He waits the time which the Father has kept in His own power. It dwells in the light, as Christ is in the light, and may not look into the outer darkness. But it must know no self-will. Outside of Him (*χωρὶς*¹ *ἐμοῦ*) it can do nothing. It is a voice repeating, as best it may, the heavenly Intercession. Beyond Christ's prayer it has no prayer. It abides in Him, and His word abides in it; it asks and receives, and its joy is full—in measure as it recognises itself as a Divine activity of the Spirit of the Lord.

¹ St. John xv. 5.

The Pentecostal Gift in relation to Prayer
as a Divine Activity : (b) In the Personal Communion of the Soul with God.

BY THE REV. S. MARCUS DILL, M.A., ALLOWAY.

ONE of the most noticeable features of the Advent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost is the marvellous change effected in the character and conduct of the disciples. It is in itself interesting to observe the spiritual transformation on that occasion, but what has specially to be recognised is that these results constitute an essential element in the claim of Divine Authority on which the religion of Christ is based. The fact that there were then communicated life and energy, knowledge and hope, love and self-sacrifice, peace and joy, of which there had been no previous experience, is one of the strongest reasons for accepting the supernaturalness of this incident. The argument in favour of the Pentecostal Gift as the Advent of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus is therefore the same as that indicated by our Lord in maintaining His Messiahship. "The blind," He said, "receive their sight, and the

lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them."

To sceptical critics the excitement of Pentecost suggests little more than one of those spasms of fanaticism which occasionally seize ignorant and unruly multitudes, but such an explanation is untenable in view of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual elevation which was then effected, and which never thereafter disappeared. Before Pentecost, in spite of the advantages derived from the constant companionship, the patient instruction, the repeated miracles of the Incarnate Son of God, the disciples had generally been in doubt and difficulty, fear and restlessness. Their beliefs seem to have never become convictions, and their resolutions seldom developed into active performance. Their daily conduct showed too plainly that their strength was not in proportion to their willingness. Pentecost brought a new experience. What had hitherto been to them doubtful was then made certain, what had always seemed hidden from them was then clearly revealed, what had once been considered difficult or impossible was easily achieved. Moreover, the experience of that day was no evanescent impulse. The impressions then acquired have strongly been maintained in the Church for nineteen centuries down to the present hour. The explanation offered by the Church is that at Pentecost there was a transcendent contact of the Divine and the Human, in which the Spirit of the ascended Saviour came to His disciples according to His promise, and secured to them, and to all who should ever after-

wards be animated with the same beliefs, the most intimate personal fellowship with God. S. John speaks for the whole believing company when he tells us in his First Epistle, "Truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son, Jesus Christ."¹

To this fellowship, which is the characteristic work of the Holy Ghost, and the climax of all religious inspiration, there has been from the beginning a gradual advancement in the progressive revelation of Divine truth. The Advent of the Holy Ghost that He might be *in man* as an indwelling power, although not an isolated exception to the Divine order, is to be viewed as the latest and most transcendent of those Acts of God of which the object has been to develop a "perfect man, the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."² In the material world God had at first discovered Himself as the Almighty. In the various forms of vital energy which belong to the animal and vegetable kingdoms God had unveiled Himself as the Lord of Life. In man endowed with intellectual and moral functions which constituted the Divine image, God had proclaimed Himself a Being of Infinite Goodness, Intelligence, and Truth. The "whole creation"³ had therefore the inspiring hope that the Divine would be still more fully revealed in the Human, and that hope was realised in the Incarnation when the Eternal Word folded the nature of man as a vesture around His Person, and made it the instrument by which He should act on Humanity. In this pure and perfect Manhood of our Lord the Holy Spirit found a congenial home, and from that Manhood exalted by the right hand of

¹ S. John i. 3.² Eph. iv. 13.³ Rom. viii. 22.

God the Spirit was "shed forth"¹ on the Church to be the medium of "fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ." Thus it was that, in and by the Incarnate life of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Spirit was revealed to be (as Bishop Andrewes has so happily said) "the very love and love-knot of the Father and the Son,"—the love of the Father flowing with personal intensity from the Father to the Son, and returning from the Son to the Father, whilst all the graces and virtues belonging to the exalted Humanity of our Lord were imparted to His Church that participating in this fellowship she might become "the fulness (το πλήρωμα) of Him that filleth all in all." This truth is well expressed by the late Professor Milligan: "We seem to be taught that the Spirit bestowed upon us by the glorified Lord is not the Third Person of the Trinity in the soleness of the Personality possessed by Him before the foundations of the world were laid: but rather that Person as He entered into, took possession of, consecrated and 'perfected' the human nature of our Lord. We seem to be taught that the Spirit whom, as Believers, we now receive is the Spirit of the Christ as Christ now is and not as He was before He became flesh and tabernacled among us."²

The Holy Ghost, then, no less than the Father, is revealed in Christ, as well as spoken about by Christ; and He is revealed in both His aspects—as the Power of the Father resting on the Son, and as the Love of the Son toward the Father. The descent, and the abiding on Christ of the Holy Ghost, were the sign of His Messiahship³ His love to the

¹ Acts ii. 33. ² *The Ascension of our Lord*, p. 172. ³ S. John i. 23.

Father, His unfailing confidence in Him, His obedience unto death, His love unending to those whom His Father gave to Him, His rising to "ascend" (He says) "unto My Father and your Father,"¹ are the tokens of *His* Sonship; and similar to these are the tokens of *our* sonship, which, in the Church of God, we enjoy in Christ Jesus. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His,"² and the Spirit of Christ is ever, and (in varying measure, no doubt, according to the measure of faith) in every man "the Spirit of power, and of love, and a sound mind."³

The Spirit of power—to enable Christians to do the saving works of their exalted Head—"The works that I do, shall ye do also; and greater works than these shall ye do because I go unto the Father"⁴; and the Spirit of love—a Godward Spirit, uprising toward Heaven, lifting our hearts above all that is carnal and seen and temporal, teaching us to "worship the Father" (who "seeketh us to worship Him") "in Spirit and in truth."⁵ He is in us (so S. Paul describes Him) "the Spirit of Adoption whereby we cry, Abba, Father."⁶

Prayer, it has been said, is the very breath of the Christian's life; *and this is the kind of prayer*—the lifting up of our desires in the Son by the Spirit to the Father. "Father, Our Father"—such an address to God was not reached by the most advanced of the saints of the Old Testament. They could, at most, say with a Psalmist, "Like as a Father,"⁷ or reason,

¹ S. John xx. 17.² Romans viii. 9.³ 2 Tim. i. 7.⁴ S. John xiv. 12.⁵ S. John iv. 23.⁶ Rom. viii. 15.⁷ Psalm ciii. 13.

with the Prophet, "Doubtless Thou art our Father,"¹ or predict that the coming Son of David shall say to God, "Thou art my Father";² they did not themselves know God in this dear relationship. But "our Father" is the first word of Christian prayer—the first word, and the last word too—"Father, I have sinned," "Father into Thy hands."

The "Spirit of Adoption" is the Spirit of Christ Jesus. He is, therefore, in us first of all the Spirit of a filial interest in, and of zeal for, whatever concerns the glory of our Father, teaching us to offer first the First Petition of the Lord's Prayer, "Hallowed be Thy NAME," and carrying us with the interests of Jesus throughout the world—"Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth, as it is done in heaven"; teaching us to look to God, not to ourselves or to the world, for the sustenance of life; to ask forgiveness in the spirit of forgiveness, to be "tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven us";³ and, conscious of our feebleness and frailty, to pray for continual protection and deliverance from that Evil One, "out of whose kingdom of darkness" God's love "translated us into the Kingdom of His dear Son."⁴

Thus, while there is uplifting in the Christian's fellowship with God, there is no pride. The spirit of Christian devotion is a spirit of humility, even as it is one of thankfulness and joy. It is so, just because it is the filial spirit, wrought in us by the Spirit of the Son.

Such, beyond doubt, is the historical type of devo-

¹ Isaiah lxiii. 16. ² Psalm lxxxix. 26. ³ Eph. iv. 32. ⁴ Col. i. 13.

tion in the Christian Church. It is a *special* type, utterly unlike either the proud fatalism of the Mahommedan, the melancholy resignation of the Buddhist, or the alternate fear and revel of the worshippers of Nature; and distinctly an advance, as we have seen, upon even the ardent piety of the saints of Israel.

It came, a new thing, with the Gift of Pentecost. It has never since been absent from the Church of the Redeemer. It is, moreover, a type of devotion not confined to the Church's heroes, her saints and martyrs, but flowering freely, like some indigenous plant, over every land where she has taken root, among all classes of the people, among the poor, among the sorrowful, among the little ones.

This is the most advanced spiritual condition of which in present circumstances mankind has cognisance. It was expounded for us, briefly and exactly, when it first appeared, by the Apostle S. Paul. "The Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit also maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And He who searcheth the hearts knoweth what is in the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God."¹

How wonderfully, when we analyse this, does it express at once the condition in which as yet, the believer in Christ knows himself but too well to lie, the Helper Who "dwelleth with him," the activities to which He nerves him, and the hope of which He is the living earnest! It is part of that

¹ Rom. viii. 26.

"sound mind," whereof He is the Spirit, that we are under no delusion as to our present state of weakness, imperfection, sinfulness. The evil which still clings to us may indeed blind us to the right perception of the things for which we ought to pray. Along with our honest aspirations, wishes that are at least partial, if not selfish, easily obtrude themselves. But the Spirit helpeth us. He becomes our Comforter, or rather our Advocate (*παράκλητος*). Coming to us from the Father through the Son, He acts for us as the skilful advocate would do in an earthly court of justice, laying out our case, presenting it aright, pleading for our ignorance with arguments whose full significance we cannot guess, with an eloquence which transcends our comprehension, even while it carries us along with it. Thus does the Holy Spirit charge Himself with our interests before God, leading us to God, in the attitude and mind of little children, and giving us, in the Apostle's words, "access"¹ unto the Father.

Christian prayer is thus (like the work of sanctification, of which it is indeed an instrument and part) essentially a Divine activity—a joint work of the Divine and of the human in the person of the believer in Christ. The Spirit comes to us from God—"which we have of God," says the Apostle; He regenerates, awakes, enlightens us: He speaks in us; but we whom He has regenerated speak, desire, and pray with Him; it is our desires, though He hath implanted them, that He utters and develops. By the purity, the strength, the clearness of our response may our individual advancement in the Christian

¹ Rom. v. 2.

path be measured. But our goal is indicated by the direction in which, under His manuduction,¹ we are journeying. The Spirit who is our Helper now wills not to leave us till He has done that which He hath spoken to us of, and changed us from glory to glory after the image of Jesus Christ. The fellowship begun on earth will be perfected in heaven, and all the desires of our soul will be satisfied in that day.

¹ The word is Bp. Pearson's.

The Pentecostal Gift in Relation to the Sacraments: (a) their Efficacy and Efficacy of Christ through the Holy Spirit.

THE REV. H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A.

THE term Sacrament, as appears from the title of this paper, is used here under the limitation generally accepted in the practice of the Reformed Churches, to those two ordinances of which it can be said without explanation or qualification that they are "ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel";¹ a limitation in which the formularies of the Churches of Scotland and of England agree, and for the same reasons given. The limitation is convenient; for by consent of all, these two ordinances stand in a category by themselves. They are alone in the authority of their institution; by their universal relation to all Christians; by their use of matter as well as of act and word; and by this, that together they cover the field of "all that pertains to life and Godliness." They are respectively the Sacraments of entrance into Christ, and of life in Christ. There is no room for a third of the same order. It is therefore of

¹ *Conf. of Faith*, xxvii. 4; *XXXIX. Art.* xxv.

great convenience to restrict some term to embrace these two ordinances, and include no other. It is more than convenient—it is expedient; since if one term is habitually used to class other rites or ordinances with these, something is taken from their honour—the supremacy of their importance is obscured—and something of their claim to our exertion of faith in contact with them, may seem to be claimed for that which is not in the same sense (as it will be admitted that, for example, marriage is not) a point of faith or a means of grace.

As for the number of the Sacraments, that must obviously depend on the definition of a Sacrament. A word means what it is used to mean. Etymology goes a very little way to determine the sense of words which have been long in use. It is too late in the day, for instance, to attempt to revert to the derivative force of such a word as “catholic,” or to define what is catholic by reference to a Lexicon, *sub vocibus*, *κατα ὅλος*. Where terms connote things or ideas in Holy Scripture, we are bound in our use of them by the use of them there; but Sacrament is not a Scriptural word. It is the Latin equivalent adopted for the Greek *μυστήριον*. None can question that there are more *μυστήρια* than two; and so far as that goes, it gives no ground for restriction of the term Sacrament, as we have restricted it. The Reformers had no definite rule in the matter. “Some of them distinguished between greater Sacraments and less. Others of them applied the word loosely to such of them as they thought worthy of it. Thus Calvin uses it in connection with ordination and confirmation, and even of the Christian

Sabbath. But all of these were at one in setting above and apart from the others the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as having been instituted by Christ Himself, and obligatory on all His members (*Scot. Conf.*, p. 78. 1722) " ¹. " Richard Baxter distinguishes between 'three sorts of Sacraments'; in the second sense of the name, in which it is taken to mean 'any solemn Investiture of a person by ministerial delivery, in a state of Church privileges, or some special Gospel mercy,' he grants 'that there are five Sacraments—Baptism, Confirmation, Absolution, the Lord's Supper, and Ordination'; and elsewhere he declares that 'they that peremptorily say without distinguishing, that there are but two Sacraments in all, do but harden them (the Papists) by the unwarrantable narrowing of the word.'" ²

It is necessary to distinguish. The Sacramental principle of "a spiritual relation" between sign and thing signified ³—the use of sign to connote the application of Divine operation of grace—is found elsewhere than in Baptism and the Eucharist. It is a principle that fundamentally underlies the whole relation of the creature to Him of whom "the invisible things from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." ⁴ It is the principle which underlies the whole process of redemption by the Incarnation—the acceptance by the Deity of human conditions in which to relate Himself to humanity in order to

¹ Dr. Leishman, unpublished MS.

² *Lux Mundi*, 12th Edition, p. 311.

³ *Confession of Faith*, xxvii. 2.

⁴ Romans i. 20.

make man "partaker of the Divine nature."¹ At the same time it is a principle which reaches its clearest development in those two institutions which we call distinctively *the* Sacraments. These are not isolated or exceptional phenomena in the system of the Church's life—they are rather the points at which the formative idea of the whole system is typically illustrated: central and culminating *μυστήρια*, in which "the mystery of the Christ"² becomes graphic—in which the secret method of the Spirit, followed throughout the economy of His operation, is embodied in final simplicity, that we may understand. They are the points in our spiritual experience at which the far-spreading stratum of the rock on which that life is borne and is lived, crops above its surface as a visible peak. But the rock which comes in sight at these points is that which underlies the whole area of our life in Christ.

The method illustrated is that of our Lord's operation by the Pentecostal Spirit. In one aspect, at least, the distinctive characteristic of that method is the "covenant security" with which we look for its operation through appointed means of grace. Without at all questioning that in His Pentecostal energy, also, the Spirit is as the wind which "bloweth where it listeth,"³ "dividing severally to each man as He wills,"⁴ it may be recognised that such operation is less peculiar to His manifestation in Christ, and more parallel with His manifestation to humanity in general. As mediated by Christ to the Church, His symbol is that of the River of the Living Water,

¹ 1 Peter i. 4.

² Ephesians iii. 4.

³ S. John iii. 8.

⁴ 2 Cor. xii. 11.

flowing from Christ's mediatorial throne and going through the city of God, that all things in it may live. The wind bloweth where it listeth: the River is fixed in channel and sure in flow. The wind comes to us; but he who thirsts is bidden go to the River and take. And he must seek it in its bed. He must "go to them that sell."¹ "The outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of Redemption are His ordinances."

The inward operations of the Spirit are not ignored; the extraordinary operations of grace are not excluded—in one sense each Christian life is a continuous illustration of them, the grace of God meeting each in a providence wholly peculiar to the individual. But the obvious and habitual method of education and nutrition in the Household of God is by ordinance. As in the natural household there is a broad parental provision which is common to all the children of the house—one care, one shelter, one table—a provision in respect of which there is no difference between child and child, while there is also a peculiar care of each child, a separate dealing, a secret of affection between the parent and that one of his offspring, and a provision for its special need as if it were the only one—so it is in Christ. He knows His own sheep by name, and each "dwells in the secret place of the Lord"; while at the same time the ordinary means of grace, common to each with all in the one Body, are His ordinances. And their efficacy is through the Pentecostal Spirit, who as a stream of life from Christ is ever found in those channels which Christ prepared for Him before He

¹ S. Matthew xxv. 9.

sent Him. Elsewhere and in other ways He seeks us, He meets us, He divides severally as He wills. But in these we may seek Him. "Let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will let him take of the Water of Life freely."

The efficacy of all ordinances is through the Holy Ghost. In themselves they are channels only; we resort to them only for their content of grace. This appears most plainly in that most instructive interval in which the Church was left for a moment "orphan," between the Ascension and Pentecost, to learn that apart from Christ it could do nothing, and that without the Paraclete its endowment of ordinance conveyed nothing. For the Church then possessed all that it has ever possessed of Word, Ministry, Sacrament, prayer. Christ had already dug those channels before He was taken up. But they remained dry channels until the sluiceways of the Heavens were opened. The Body which God had prepared for the Second Adam from this dust which we are, lay complete in every member but lifeless, until again the Lord breathed into it the Breath of Life, and it arose and became a Living Soul. Ordinance in itself, apart from the Pentecostal gift, is, as S. Paul tells of one pre-Pentecostal ordinance of God, "nothing."¹

While, however, this is equally true of every ordinance, it is most evident of the Sacraments. The Word is instructive. It appeals to reason. It is hortatory, and appeals to conscience. It may be conceived to possess some intrinsic efficacy, which it requires no venture of faith to realise. The intrinsic

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 19, Ἡ περιτομή οὐδὲν ἐστί.

efficacy apart from the prevenient and convincing activity of the Spirit is no doubt limited to a natural result. But that is a distinction which the natural man does not draw. He is ready enough to believe that the Word may in itself do good—and however little it rules his own way, he may be not unwilling to secure its influence for society, especially for the younger and poorer elements of society. So of the Ministry : it is reasonable to suppose that they serve a useful purpose if only “to help keep order in the State by policing the populous districts and preaching respect for property.”¹ And so, even, of Prayer; nothing is more natural than to pray—under stress of circumstances the impulse to call on God shows itself as an instinctive necessity. To pray implies certainly a measure of faith—at least “that God is”; this granted, even the instinctive cry to Him, though blind as that of an infant, may have hope of answer. The higher form of prayer, the rational converse of the soul with the God and Father of our Lord, which is informed by the Spirit and is the ordinance to which our Lord’s promise attaches, doubtless implies a higher faith. Nevertheless it is a faith whose exercise is made easier by the basis of prayer in instinct.

In approaching the Sacraments, however, as points of efficacious grace, we are thrown wholly upon faith in God. It is not that they are more powerless in themselves than other means of grace, but that their inadequacy of themselves to effect spiritual results is more transparently obvious. The garb and fashion in which they meet us is so manifestly earthly

¹ *Religio Laici*, p. 148.

and material, so external to the soul which is called to them, that it is compelled to look at once, through and beyond their natural elements to the Supernatural which, for a confessedly spiritual purpose, offers them to us. As institutions of Christ they are intelligible or credible only as it is realised that Christ Himself stands behind and above His own ordinance—following, act by act and word by word, in the sphere of eternal reality which He now inhabits, that which here is done in His name: so that what here is so done is in that higher sphere verily accomplished, sign and reality coinciding and mutually implied. "The parts of a Sacrament are two; the one an outward and sensible sign, used according to Christ's own appointment; the other an inward and spiritual grace thereby signified."¹ The thing signified is part of the Sacrament. The sign and the reality constitute one thing, a *Sacrament*, as body and soul constitute one human being. The body without the soul is not the man—it is a corpse; but neither is the soul without the body the man—it is a ghost. It is their mysterious unity which constitutes the human; and it is the unity of sign and reality which constitutes the Sacramental: in which the sign is more than symbol—it is the indication of a content of grace through the present activity of the Holy Ghost.²

¹ *Larger Catechism*, 163.

² Professor Beeching (*Religio Laici*, p. 147) suggests a distinction between the conception of the miraculous and of the supernatural in a Sacrament. The distinction is important: the miraculous, if it be exerted, is necessarily effective. It implies its proper result in the object on which it operates. The supernatural is present, but is not necessarily discerned or accepted. It is contained in the Sacrament

In resorting then to a Sacrament, our resort is to the spiritual content by means of the sign—as one grasps the hand of a friend, bodily touch to bodily touch, that spirit may greet spirit. It is the spiritual in man which encounters the gift by the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament—yet not the spiritual in him only, any more than in the Sacrament he encounters naked Spirit; but his whole nature, material as well as spiritual, meets with the whole of Christ, Who assumes to Himself these material instrumentalities, and is pleased through them to effect upon the responsive recipient that which the Sacraments respectively intimate. Thus Calvin says: “Water, though it is a fading element, truly testifies to us in Baptism the true presence of the Blood of Jesus Christ, and of His Spirit.”¹ And again: “Christ not only died once and rose again for us, but also truly feeds and nourishes us by His own Flesh and Blood, so that we are one with Him, and His life is common to us. For though He is in Heaven for a short time till He come to judge the world, I believe that He, through the secret and incomprehensible agency of His Spirit, gives life to our souls by the substance of His Body and Blood.”²

“Through the secret and incomprehensible agency and is offered in the Sacrament. But it is present through the action of the Holy Spirit (“after a spiritual manner”), Who may be resisted. S. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 29) evidently implies that the Body of Christ may be proposed without being “discerned.”

¹ *Tracts*, ii. 135, An. 1540.

² *Ibid*, p. 134. Dr. Leishman points out to me that “the language of both these passages must have been well and maturely weighed, for we find both embodied, almost verbatim, twenty years after in the Huguenot Conf. of Faith.” Quick’s *Synodicon*, lvi.

of His Spirit, HE gives." The actions of both Sacraments are proper to Christ only. It is He only Who takes away sins. He is the door—by Him whoever enters must enter. He is Himself the Baptiser.¹ He is its true Minister: He uses our ministry according to the power given Him on earth, but the act remains His own. It is He Who shows His own death to the Father and claims its purchase: and only He Who gives His flesh and blood that we may have life. The Table is His, and the Feast is His. In either case the Sacramental element and action is to us but the window glass—which we do not look at, but through its transparency to what is beyond, to Christ Who "standeth at the altar and offereth every prayer"²—exalted Prince and Saviour to give both repentance and forgiveness—and more—to give Himself to the forgiven: "through the secret and incomprehensible agency of His Spirit."

Thus the Sacraments, which to natural observation appear a strangely materialistic excrescence upon the spirituality of Christianity, difficult to reconcile with its general system, reveal themselves on better knowledge as the most entirely spiritual parts of its system. In respect of them we are cast entirely upon a realisation of the actual and present activity of the Holy Spirit, without which they would offer no point of faith. We are brought in them face to

¹ Augustine somewhere says: "Baptismus, a quocunque ministretur, semper est Christi"—a saying which Jerome quotes as "Splendidissimum iudicium." *Praelect. Theol.*, ii. 19, *Church Times*, April 17, 1903.

² *Scottish Hymnal*, No. 322.

face with the immediate will and act of Christ. In them we go past the merely ethical relation to His teaching, and past the merely fiduciary relation to His redemptive work, and enter into relation with His Person and Self. We reach the objective occasions of vital incorporation with Him, our whole nature with His whole nature. The "contemptibility of Sacraments," which deceives the external observer, is in reality the measure of their absolutely spiritual character. The outward is here so little, the inward and Heavenly is so much, the veil that hides from us the Divine so slight. We are not in peril of putting (as some have said) "the Sacraments in place of Christ"; for we find in the Sacraments nothing except an efficacy of Christ by the Holy Spirit. They are what they are to us, because while in other things we meet Christ's truth and law and work and love and grace and promise, in them we meet Christ Himself, and REST IN HIM BY FAITH.

The Pentecostal Gift in Relation to the Sacraments: (ii.) Baptism, the Grace Given and Improved.

THE REV. H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A.

THE subject of Baptism has been already fully treated in the Conferences of this Society.¹ It is only its relation to the Pentecostal Gift that has to be considered here. The specific grace of Baptism is that of our translation from our natural condition, as children of the first Adam, into the Body of the Second Adam in which dwells the Holy Ghost as mediated by our Lord. This translation is the act of God. In the Eucharist we ourselves have a work to do—we show the Lord's death; they who receive that Sacrament are, in the first place, themselves ministers of the commemoration. In Baptism, on the contrary, the recipient is passive. No man baptises himself. He yields himself to be the subject of Divine operation. He submits himself to the gracious Will which designs his salvation. The antecedents, indeed, of Baptism demand the exertion of the man's own will. He comes at the call of

¹ *The Holy Sacrament of Baptism—the place assigned to it in the Economy of Grace*, by Dr. John Macleod. 1895.

God—he confesses Christ—he renounces the enemies of God and his soul—he bows to the yoke of the Saviour. But these acts are not Baptism—they are its conditions. In the Sacrament itself the human will has no other part than the effort to be passively receptive.

Farther, if Baptism be recognised as entrance into the sphere of grace, it is evident that it is vain to look for anything of ours in it. It is *ex hypothesi* precedent to the new life in us—we need look for none of the processes of the new life except out of the grace of whose operation Baptism marks the communication. “The earthly things,”¹ the things which natural experience teaches of our natural sinfulness and impotence, the things which call on us to die to self at Christ’s feet that we may rise to newness of life in Him—these may be apprehended, and must form (for adult and infant) the basis on which Baptism is sought. But it would be vain to look for apprehension of “the Heavenly things” until there is life which can be conscious of them. “The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, . . . neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.”² What is predicated in Scripture of the effect of Baptism cannot be predicated of the soul in its natural capacity. It is predicated of God Who quickeneth the dead. A perception of this should remove the difficulties which arise in many minds in relation to Baptism, and especially in relation to Baptism when administered to the infant. All that is attributed to it is attributed

¹ S. John iii. 12.

² Cor. ii. 14.

to God; and all that is of God is both perfect and sure. Nothing is asserted as to our response to the word and gift of God, nor as to anything which depends on our response. God has granted to the baptised a severance from the old condemned life. God has set them in the kingdom of His grace, in which is the forgiveness of sins. God has engrafted them into the humanity which by the resurrection of Christ is alive with an eternal life. The Holy Spirit, Porter of the door,¹ has opened to them the communion of His own energies. They are raised into the atmosphere of the powers of the age that is coming.² The calling and election of God are set upon them. All this we can confidently affirm. What we cannot affirm is that they will undoubtedly give diligence to make their calling and election sure.³ What we cannot know is that they will embrace and appropriate the gift of God in Christ. It is possible to receive the grace of God in vain.⁴

What, therefore, we have to consider in Baptism is the Divine intention—always holding in mind that what is said of its content and effect is said of the act of God, upon which human faith is to proceed, and which faith must apprehend as certain and definite, in order to respond to it. Nothing is necessarily assumed as to the response. On the Divine side there is complete and assured operation: on the human side there may be defect, partial or absolute—defect of knowledge, or of consent, or of reception, or of co-operation. No abundance of grace super-

¹ S. John x. 3.

² Heb. vi. 5.

³ 2 S. Peter i. 10.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 2, 10.

sedes our individuality or ignores our liberty of self-determination. We can speak with certainty only of that which is of God. On the other hand, no failure on our part to recognise or lay hold of the purpose of a Divine act and its potentialities, can deny that purpose, or hinder that it should have been carried into effect so far as the point where God has done all, and must await the response of His creature. Christ has died for all men, but all do not believe to the salvation of their souls. In like manner to certain persons individually is signified the will of God, that the fruits of the atonement should be theirs, and the process of appropriating to them the benefits of redemption is carried on up to the limit at which the independence of human personality meets all Divine action. In speaking of the effect of Baptism, we can speak only of this which stands in the faithfulness of God—for the rest, the result in the baptised, there remains the uncertainty of the human. The graft is made; it may or may not lay hold of the life of the Stock, and become an integral part of the Vine. The alien is adopted into the Household of God; he may grow up a faithful son, or rebellious and prodigal. But with God there is not yea and nay. We may securely affirm the objectivity and reality of what He signifies Himself to do, as verily done. In measure as we recognise this fact, that Baptism is the act of God and portends nothing that is not the act of God—being on man's side a mere dying to the past and to self—we have confidence to hear and understand the Scriptural assertions as to its profound and far-reach-

ing consequence. Without this recognition, hesitation in assent to these assertions is inevitable. In this "our boldness is of God." "It is not I who say these things," Cyril, in speaking of Baptism, interrupts himself to protest, "but the Lord Jesus Christ, He Who has the control of the matter" . . . *πολμηρὸς ὁ λόγος, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔμος*. The saying is daring, but it is not mine: Jesus is the setter forth of it; and do thou take from me the demonstration of His words out of the Divine Scriptures."¹

There remains this question: it is agreed that man cannot of himself answer to the Divine call; there must be an operation of the Spirit, not only with the man to change his status, but in the man to enable him to apprehend new status and correspond to it: is this operation assured by Baptism to the baptised?—is this grace sacramentally conferred upon the soul along with the gift of a place in the life of Christ?

In reply to such a question it may seem that we are in measure cast upon a broad faith in God. The answer will more or less depend on the general conception entertained of the Divine character and of the nature of the Divine faithfulness. We are in the hands of God. At the lowest estimate Baptism is a sign from Him—a sign of our introduction to a condition of opportunity and of responsibility. It may appear difficult to imagine that in any case the opportunity is in reality non-existent from a want of power, in those to whom it is signified, to seize it; or that God calls to a responsibility, which, since His

¹ *Cat. Myst.*, iii. 2.

grace is denied, can mean only the greater condemnation. It may seem that if Baptism be even significant, it must be also efficacious, in the sense of being a grace which at least enables—sufficient to constitute an actual capacity for life in Christ. Introduction to the communion of the Spirit of Christ cannot be wholly external in its effects. The results cannot remain merely potential, since, in order that their potentiality may exist, there must be a communication to the soul of a capacity to realise them. We believe in Christ—we must believe also in the Spirit of Christ: in His mercy and pity for the souls whom He draws into His sphere, and on whom He sets Christ's seal, so that "in that day" they must be judged, not as Christ's citizens, but as His own servants, to whom He has divided His substance.¹ Whatever bids us confide in God assures us that in Baptism the Spirit of our Lord enters into a vital relation with the Baptised, which makes it possible for them to answer to that demand for "the obedience of faith" which Baptism imposes, and that the efficacy of the Sacrament is not only for the soul, but in the soul.

It will, however, be universally admitted that the grace so communicated is initial only, and prevenient to the fruition of the possibilities which Baptism constitutes. Regeneration must follow the analogy of generation. Since it is the cause of life it must be before life, communicating the capacity to assimilate the life in which the Baptised are imbedded. The nature of Christ formed in us

¹ S. Luke xix. 13, 14.

must absorb from Him and grow up into Him, holding the Head. The Baptised are admitted to the communion of the Holy Ghost and are partakers of the "root and fatness" of the tree into which they are grafted.¹ Manifestly the office of the Spirit towards them does not end either with their admission to Christ, nor in such initial and enabling grace as we conceive to accompany that admission. What He has quickened He nourishes. He is continuously the secret of all development and growth in Christ, in whom through Him they abide.

It remains to ask whether for this end the grace of Baptism is adequate. Is Baptism a complete sacrament, ensuring on the side of ordinance to the Baptised "all things that pertain to life and godliness," in virtue of which they may advance to that full participation in their calling which is marked by participation in the Eucharist? Is Baptism exhaustive on the side of ordinance as "sign, seal, and application" of initiation into Christ, and of the bestowing and indwelling of His Spirit? Or is it to be regarded as negative in operation, conferring only remission of sins and deliverance from condemnation?—or, if more than this, is it nevertheless an imperfect sacrament unless conjoined at some point of greater or less interval, with participation in a further "mystery" by which its proper grace is brought to effect?

It is certain that under the immediate administration of Apostles, Baptism was, in cases at least, followed by the "laying on of hands," and that

¹ Rom. xi. 17.

in those cases the laying on of the hands of the Apostles was followed by a "receiving" or "giving" of the Holy Ghost. The examples recorded are two in number; that of the mission of S. Peter and S. John to Samaria (Acts viii. 14-25), and that of S. Paul's dealings with twelve disciples of John the Baptist, whom he found at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1-7). There is besides an enumeration of "laying on of hands" among the foundational things of the word of Christ (Heb. vi. 2), but without definition of the intention with which the act in this case is performed: it is certainly conjoined with the mention of Baptism, but also with "resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment"; and the laying on of hands in the discipline of reconciliation, which seems the more probable sense in the remaining reference, "Lay hands suddenly on no man" (1 S. Tim. v. 22) may seem here also the more adequate middle term between the beginning of the Christian course in Baptism and its goal in that day.

The clear allusions to the rite are the two in Acts. There is no evidence that it was ministered by others than Apostles, nor that it was by them ministered generally. The single case of Baptism by S. Philip followed by laying on of hands by S. Peter and S. John, is too narrow to support the inference that Apostles invariably followed Evangelists for this purpose. The Apostles were twelve or thereby in number: Evangelists were numerous; the world to which the Gospel, even in the Apostolic age, had spread, is wide; disciples were countless. The physical facts are against the supposition. There

is no evidence to connect the laying on of the hands of the Apostles with other than those exceptional gifts of the Spirit which were "for signs to them that believed not." At Samaria the result was such that Simon Magus "saw it." At Ephesus the result was that the Baptised spake with tongues and prophesied. Nor is there any evidence that in all cases in which these gifts were conferred, they were conferred by the laying on of hands, or by the laying on of the hands of Apostles. There is no evidence at all as to the Apostolic practice in the case of infants baptised in those households which received Baptism. Nor is it permissible to argue, as is frequently done,¹ that the term Baptism in Holy Scripture includes the laying on of hands, and that what is said of the baptised must be understood as of those who have also received the further rite. In Acts viii. 16 the one term certainly does not include the other. The Samaritans were baptised—but the Holy Ghost was as yet fallen on none of them. The Baptist's disciples at Ephesus received Christian Baptism, and S. Paul's imposition of hands is separately mentioned.² In Hebrews vi. 2 the rites are distinguished, not identified. (S. Paul 1 Cor. i. 14-17) makes it very certain that in his view Baptism, which he had not ministered there except to Crispus and Gaius, did not include the laying on of hands, which being an Apostle he undoubtedly ministered. It is seldom that in argument the question at issue is so openly

¹ E.g. Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 298, *Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*, p. 1; and (apparently) Hall, *Confirmation*, p. 30.

² Acts xix. 5, 6.

begged, as when to prove that laying on of hands is necessary to complete Baptism, it is asserted that the use of the word Baptism in Scripture shows that the laying on of hands must be understood to be included.

Leaving out of account then these assumptions, it is impossible to doubt that Baptism is in itself the Sacrament of the gift of life in Christ and of the indwelling Spirit of grace. We are not only buried with Christ in Baptism, but *therein* we are risen with Him, and are quickened together with Him;¹ and this Spiritual Resurrection is to result in Heavenly affections,² and in our walking in newness of life.³ It is needless to labour this point farther.⁴ But it is very noticeable that S. Paul (1 Cor. xii. 1-13) appears to trace "gifts" in the fully charismatic sense directly to the operation of Baptism—"There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. . . . All these worketh that One and the self-same Spirit . . . for by one Spirit are we all baptised into one body."

The *Didache* contains a Baptismal ritual which has no mention of other rites than the sacred bath with fasting;⁵ Justin Martyr gives an account of Baptism, and without mention of laying on of hands or any equivalent, conducts the Baptised directly to the Eucharist.⁶ One may not argue from this silence that in the second century hands

¹ Coloss. ii. 12, 13.

² *Ib.* iii. 1.

³ Rom. vi. 4.

⁴ See Stone, *Holy Baptism*, p. 77: his conclusion is "that the Holy Spirit personally indwells in those who have been baptised, although they have not yet been confirmed."

⁵ *Did.* c. vii.

⁶ *Apol.* v. 79-85.

were not laid on the Baptised; but one may certainly argue that no such importance was attached to the practice, as must have attached if it were the condition of the gift of the Spirit. Tertullian is the first to make mention of laying on of hands as practised in the post-apostolic Church.¹ "Next to this (*i.e.* to unction after immersion) the hand is laid upon us, inviting and invoking the Holy Spirit through the blessing." But ritual had by Tertullian's date begun to develop; the laying on of hands is conjoined by him along with *unction*, which no one contends was a usage continuous from the Apostles; there is no evidence that the laying on of hands to which he testifies as used in his day, was that practised by the Apostles continuously maintained during the intervening century. Cyprian, two generations later, is the first to connect the laying on of hands as a sequel to Baptism with the Apostolic practice;² and he speaks of the "necessity" of unction as well, that he who is baptised "may be anointed of God and have within him the grace of Christ,"³ which lessens the weight of his testimony to the importance of the rite with which he makes unction parallel.

There can be no doubt that from Cyprian's date onwards, Imposition of hands and Chrism were both associated with the ritual of Baptism, and were administered immediately after it, whether to adult or infant. Of these two added rites, Chrism was certainly symbolic only, and has no root in recorded N.T. practice. But of the two chrism is the one upon which the greater stress is laid by early writers; *it*

¹ *De Bap.* 7, 8.

² *Epist.* lxxiii.

³ *Epist.* lxx. 3.

was maintained, when the laying on of hands came to be omitted;¹ and it is that which alone explicitly survives in Oriental and Roman practice. This does not give the impression of a consciousness in the Early Church that, while unction was unquestionably a ceremony of ecclesiastical origin, the laying on of hands was an Apostolic ordinance, without which Baptism is incomplete and largely ineffective. It rather gives the impression that the laying on of hands was recognised as also an edifying ceremony, probably suggested as appropriate by the analogous Apostolic act, but not rigidly identified with it in form or effect. Otherwise it is inconceivable that it should have been in any use omitted.

Nor does the identification receive support from the practice of reserving imposition of hands or anointing to the Bishop as chief minister. The reservation was disciplinary only, and was never absolute, and is persevered in by the West alone. What was not reserved to the Bishop, being present, once the Bishop was recognised as distinct in rank from his presbyters? What but reservation to him of the functions inherent in the presbyterate, constituted his separation from them?² In cases the administration of Baptism itself was reserved to the Bishop. In the East (the laying on of hands being disused) chrism is ministered by the presbyter; the endeavour to connect the rite so ministered with the Episcopal office (and no Anglican writer ever alludes

¹ As in the Gallican: *De Sacramentis*, iii. ; see *Min. of Grace*, p. 81.

² Comp. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, 5th ed., p. 303; Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, 2nd ed., p. 80.

to the Oriental practice without noting this) by the fact that the chrism is consecrated by the Bishop, loses force in view of the fact that not chrism only for use at Baptism, but that for unction of the sick, and indeed all the "holy oils" used in any mystery, are consecrated by the Bishop. It is not said that the Bishop is the only minister of any unction. Ambrose¹ notes that "in Egypt the presbyters seal if the Bishop be not present," and Hilary writes to the same effect; and so the Canon (Mart. Bracaren-sis, *Collection of Or. Can.* 52, quoted by Bishop Taylor) "presbyter praesente Episcopo non signet Infantes, nisi forte ab Episcopo fuerit illi praeceptum." "Praesente Episcopo," the presbyter would not bless the people; yet benediction is a ministry universally permitted to presbyters. In the West the reservation was more rigid, yet the fact of exception makes it certain that the reservation was only disciplinary, according to Jerome's saying as to the presbyter, "Praedicare eos decet, utile est benedicere, congruum confirmare."² Gregory gave dispensation to the presbyters of Sardinia, "ut baptizatos ungant." Bishop Wordsworth shows that "presbyteral confirmation was in use . . . in Gaul" c. A.D. 500,³ and says that it was very common and indeed general in the West, wherever Bishops were few.⁴

Is there not indeed a fallacy in the use of the word Confirmation as a common term for the rite of laying on of the hands of the Bishop as practised in the Anglican Communion, and the laying on of

¹ In Ephes. iv.

³ *Ministry of Grace*, p. 59.

² *Epist. ad Rusticum*.

⁴ *Ib.*, p. 82, note.

hands and anointing of baptised as they emerged from the font and as part of the ceremonial of their Baptism in the 3rd century, and also the unction of an Infant by the presbyter at its Baptism in modern Oriental usage? The word Confirmation probably came into use in the fourth century along with the postponement of the laying on of hands and unction, which resulted from the reservation of these to the Bishop, and marks the gradual change in their place from being part of the Baptismal ritual to being associated with the conscious assumption of Baptismal responsibilities by the adolescent. The historical connection is perfectly traceable, but that is hardly enough to justify its being said that the same ordinance is preserved in the Eastern and in the Anglican Communions, and that in both cases the ordinance is confirmation, and is that which we find in the practice of the Apostles. The language usual in Anglican treatises and manuals on the subject seems to assume that for a presbyter to anoint an infant in Baptism is the same as that a Bishop should, in the peculiar right of his Episcopate, lay hands upon a person satisfactorily catechised.

There does not in fact appear with regard to this matter that certainty either of doctrine or of practice, which we are accustomed to find in the Church with regard to Apostolic ordinance, or which would justify the assured tone adopted by some Anglican writers. Church history shows no general agreement as to what the form of the ordinance is, nor who are its proper ministers; nor of the persons, infant or adult, to whom it is to be administered, whether as part of baptism or as a

preparation for approach to Holy Communion ; nor of the degree of its necessity ; nor even of its purpose, whether to endow with charismata, or to strengthen existing life, or to supply a moment of self-dedication. The Greek rite and the Anglican, for example, differ in form, ministry, occasion, and largely (if one may judge by the language of the Book of Common Prayer) in intention ; they agree only in this, that in the case of each rite Baptism must precede.

It may be freely admitted that the ceremonial of Baptism be not limited to the barely valid ; but that its essential action be framed, as the essential action of the Eucharist is and has ever been,¹ in a setting of accordant act and word. Which of us is not accustomed to follow Baptism with solemn benediction ? And it may as freely be admitted that where infant Baptism is practically invariable, the normal fitness of some express recognition of the Baptised by the Church—some ceremonious act that infiefs the baptised person, now become conscious of the grace vouchsafed to him, into possession of his inheritance—is accentuated. I have myself ventured elsewhere to plead for more explicit recognition in the Church of Scotland of a confirmation, directly related to Baptism, and less directly preparatory to first communion, and with the more explicit and formal method of Benediction, the laying on of hands.² It is with no lack of appreciation of the spiritual and disciplinary value of the rite that the foregoing remarks are made.

There may be the amplest recognition of the dis-

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 34 : "The rest will I set in order, when I come."

² See Articles in *Life and Work* for November and December, 1899.

inction between life by the Holy Spirit, life and growth and grace—and on the other hand gifts of the Spirit, specific endowments for service of God and edification of the Church, which He freely divides to whom He wills. And it may be thought that it is due and fitting that the Church should supply in ordinance a point of recognition of so broad a distinction: of recognition that the Holy Spirit not only quickens and nourishes the soul in Christ, but also enriches it with qualification and attribute in measure of its readiness to yield itself to Christ for His active purposes; a point at which the Baptised may consciously and expectantly meet with that intention and work of the Spirit. And further, it may appear that in any case, but notably in the case of those baptised in infancy—seeing that a Covenant is not of one, and that Baptism is not our act, but the act of God calling for our response and embrace—there must be in the experience of those who correspond to the grace of God a conscious confession of Christ and ratification of engagement and submission of self to the Spirit for His farther and specialised operation; and that it is the office of the Church to embody in sacred rite due opportunity for the Baptised so to seek the farther grace prepared for them, and to instruct them that confession of Christ and consecration of self to Him in faith will be undoubtedly met by the Holy Spirit in a further development of His treasures of riches and wisdom.

But while we recognise this and plead for its recognition, it is difficult to go so far as to say that in the present confusion of the Church universal, we can discover any secure point of ordinance so corre-

sponding to and continuous and identical with the Apostolic "Laying on of hands," that we can say "It is to the due use of *this* that charismatic fruition of the Spirit attaches."

Our own use may not be so explicit or so fully scriptural as it easily might be. It is a use of solemn and public confession on the part of the baptised person and of solemn benediction with prayer on the part of the Ministry. Dr. Mason says of the Anglican communion: "We are . . . in at least as good a position with regard to this ordinance as some other Ancient Churches which have retained unction, but have lost the laying on of hands."¹ He probably would not question the sufficiency of those confirmations of which Bishop Hall writes: "In later times the unction came to be regarded as the distinctive outward sign in confirmation, the imposition of hands being merely an elevation of the Bishop's hands in an attitude of prayer and benediction over the candidates kneeling before him": being, that is to say, the action habitually used by ourselves. That unction "came to be regarded" as the proper form of the rite did not make it other than it was—a superadded symbol without apostolic prescription or example or promise. "We are therefore in at least as good a position with regard to this ordinance as some other Ancient Churches," although in our case also the actual manual contact is not made in the gesture of benediction. Nay, are we not even in better case than those Ancient Churches which, like ourselves, minister the rite by presbyters, but which have wholly left the Scriptural form of Benediction

¹ *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 302.

for that of chrism? Is it easy to believe that the infant so anointed is thenceforth a true, complete, and charismatic Christian, while the gifts of the Spirit are denied to those devout and obedient souls over whom, with the same intention, our presbyters pray that the Holy Ghost may come upon them, and speak the word of Blessing in the the Name of the Lord?

The Pentecostal Gift in Relation to the
Sacraments: (iii) Holy Communion: the
Presence Vouchsafed, and our Preparation,
Celebration, and Reception.

REV. H. J. WOTHERSPOON, M.A.

ON no subject has there been so much dispute as on this of the Presence in the Eucharist; yet on none has there been such agreement of statement as to positive doctrine, and in none perhaps more consent of actual faith. Sacramentarianism—the doctrine that the sacraments are bare signs, and that the consecrated elements merely represent to the imagination what they are said to be—is a divergent doctrine; scarcely anywhere or at any time affirmed by any part of the Historic Church, reformed or unreformed; repudiated by Geneva and Scotland, by Anglican and by Lutheran formulas, as emphatically as by antiquity, by the orthodox Eastern Church, or by modern Romanism. It may be practically the position of individuals—it is nowhere (with the exception that proves the rule) an authorised teaching; it may be the logical goal of tendencies, but always in the face of the Church's

formal repudiation. It is rejected by the living devotion of the great Congregation of believers. I would doubt whether it is possible to be a Sacramentarian at the Holy Table itself. A comparison of the language of the Liturgies with that of Calvin and of our own standards, and of those again with the results reached by the very comprehensive and clear analysis of Canon Gore (*The Body of Christ*, 1901) brings out in a very striking way this agreement in positive doctrine, both as to the Presence itself and as to its mode. There is, I think, agreement, substantially throughout history and throughout the Church (except for some local continental Sacramentarianism and the more recent Romanism) with regard to the presence as a presence of *Christ*, and as constituted *by the Agency of the Holy Ghost* shed forth through Him; with regard to the gift of *His Body and Blood* in the Sacrament, and to the fact that the reception of the consecrated elements is intimately identified with that bestowal; and further, with regard to the *reality* and *objectivity* both of that presence of our Lord and of that gift of His Body and Blood.

1. To assert the presence of Christ as distinguished from the presence of His Body and Blood is, it may be argued, to assert nothing distinctive concerning the Sacrament itself—since that presence is universally pledged to the Church, and wherever His congregation is constituted *in His Name* (that is to say, in His ordinance and authority, for His will and purpose), there is He, for whatever of His acts, royal, priestly, or prophetic, it is assembled: for counsel, as at

Jerusalem ; or for judgment, as in the case which S. Paul contemplates at Corinth (1 Cor. v. 5) ; or for praise, as the Apostle to the Hebrews instances, interpreting Christ to say : " In the midst of the Church will I sing praise unto Thee " (Heb. ii. 12).

But even in this there is a difference, as the act for which He is present is different—an act more or less typical of His activity, more or less involving the fulness of His personal intervention, more or less demonstrating His direct operation under the garb of our ministration for Him. This act *the Celebration of the Eucharist* involves Christ as engaged in the very central moments of His mediation. It unveils Him in the essential acts which define the present ends of the Incarnation—His Intercession, His Benediction, His presentation of Himself before the Father " in the merit of His obedience and sacrifice " (Larger Catm. 55) ; procuring for His members and bestowing upon them pardon, access, and grace, and " infusing into them " (to use Calvin's constant phrase) His own glorified life. It is an official and defined presence in the plenitude of His supreme mission and efficiency. The king, to use an illustration, is always among us, and the habitual functions of the organised national life proceed by his implicit authority, and are valid, as in his name ; yet also there are times when he appears in his proper royalty, enthroned and recognised as personally fulfilling them. The analogy is imperfect ; yet may serve to illustrate that we most joyfully confess the perpetual presence of our Lord in His Body, and the unbroken vigour of the current of His life, because of which we live also ;

and yet that we know Him face to face, and see Him with us, and behold His hand made bare, in the ultimate sanctuary of the Spiritual Temple in which we are builded together, at that moment when the mystery of His mediation is most fully expressed, and at that point at which the Spiritual forces resident in our fellowship are focussed. It is a presence special to that act and moment—definite, official, ascertained, unqualified; for in this at least all is His own—there is no uncertainty of His consent—there is no doubt but that as we follow He goes before us into the Holiest.

The presence which we find filling the consciousness of the early liturgies is this presence of the Lord. I do not think that anywhere in them we meet the conception of a presence of Christ which begins from the moment of consecration of the Elements—to be waited for as about to come when that point of the sacred service is reached, or to be hailed when it has been reached, or to be recognised as a presence existing after the consecration rather than before or in the consecration itself. The celebration is recognised as, throughout, the act of the Lord Himself, fulfilled by means of His Body upon earth; He consecrates—therefore is with us to consecrate.

Hammond, in discussing the variation of order in even the most important parts of the service, and especially the occurrence, in the Eastern versions of the liturgy, of the "Great Oblation" before the "Invocation," points out that in their thought "*the element of time must be considered to be excluded.*" The Eucharistic service is in their view "*one great*

act." The mystery is a Heavenly one, and in it "*we are transferred into the atmosphere of Heaven and absorbed in an ever-abiding present.*" The highest Sacramental language is freely used, not after, but before the consecration formulas, and distinctively in connection with the Offertories, which relate to the as yet unconsecrated gifts. And this not so much for Hammond's reason as for that which Gore indicates (*Body of Christ*, pp. 104-5) that "Christ was believed to be already present, and that, too, (in some sense) in His Manhood as High Priest. . . . Whatever was done in the Eucharist in His Name, He was believed to be present, and to be the Doer of it. He was there to speak the words and consecrate the gifts. . . . What that (Consecration) brought about was not the presence of Christ—He was already there—but His adoption of the Church's gifts to become His Body and Blood."

This conception of the Eucharist as not so much an act of ours procuring Christ's presence, as an adoption by Christ, not of the elements only for His end, but of the flock of God for the instrument of His ministry to the Father, is characteristic of the liturgies. The whole belongs to our ascension with Him, and our being made to sit with Him in the Heavenly places. The symbolism is not figurative—it is indicative of the eternal fact, which is the other part of the Sacrament—it is the unveiling of the process of Redemption, which is perpetually being fulfilled in that transcendent sphere in which we also are citizens, and have a citizenship to exercise. *Christ is the celebrant ; the table is His ;*

the acts are proper only to Himself; the gifts are His own to bestow. It is He Who enters the Holiest by His own blood—and stands before the Father and shows His wounds—and Who obtains for us that which for us He seeks; and so turns from mediating in our behalf to the Father, to mediate from the Father to us the inexpressible mercies of communion in His life.

This view of the Eucharist as rather a taking of us and our gifts into the Supernatural and Heavenly atmosphere, than a descent of Christ to the material, seems characteristic of the liturgies, and appears, for example, in the Hymn of the Great Entrance (*οἱ τὰ χερουβὶμ, κ.τ.λ.*), and in the prayers which occur in the Petrine and Constantinopolitan for the assumption of the Elements to the Heavenly Altar—and again in Leo (*Ep.*, lix. 2, *ap.* Gore, p. 57), where he says that in virtue of the Heavenly food “we pass into His flesh, who was made our flesh.” As Gore says of the theological writings of the same period: “They preferred the language which suggests the breaking away of material limits before the eye of faith”: and I think that they preferred such language because it best expressed their view; and that the conception of Christ as at a given moment, in obedience to a given formula, descending to an earthly altar and either entering into or taking the place of the elements (which we find stated with extraordinary crudeness in some modern manuals not of Roman origin), would to the Fathers of the first ages have seemed not Sacramental at all.

Calvin constantly uses the same thought: “Christ dwelling in us raises us to Himself, and transfuses

the life-giving vigour of His flesh into us" (*Second Defence*, p. 279). And so our own Reformers in the Scot. Conf., 1560: "This union and conjunction which we have with the Body and Blood of Christ Jesus . . . is wrought by operation of the Holy Ghost, who by true faith carrieth us above all things that are visible, carnal, and earthly, and maketh us to feed upon the Body and Blood of Christ Jesus . . . which are now in Heaven."

2. This presence of Christ in the Eucharist is universally recognised as effected by His mediation of the Divine Spirit. In the liturgies the central moment of the Consecration is the invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the elements after these have been offered. The prayer of invocation is an explicit recognition that the agency by which these become the vehicles of the nourishment of Eternal Life, is that of the Spirit. It is He, Who, coming not upon the gifts only, but on the supplicants as well, shall make, or show, or reveal (*ἀποφάνη, ἀναδεικνύναι*) the bread to be Christ's body, and the cup to be Christ's blood. The prayer is usually directed explicitly to God the Father, but in some (as the Ethiopic) to "the Lord," and in the Coptic St. Basil, explicitly to Christ. The response of the people with the Deacon, "Bless, O Lord, changing them by the Holy Ghost" (*μεταβάλων*) occurs in most. In the St. Mark, God is besought (in the Commemoration of the Institution) to "fulfil this sacrifice of blessing from Himself by means of the forthgoing of His Holy Spirit"; and in the narrative as to the Cup, the following remarkable language is used: "In like manner . . . having taken the cup . . . He gave

thanks and blessed and *filled it with the Holy Ghost* and gave," etc. So Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat. Myst.*, v. 5), describing the celebration, "We pray the most gracious God, to send forth His Spirit on those things which are laid before Him, to make the bread the Body of Christ, and the wine His Blood. For generally whatever the Holy Spirit touches, that is sanctified and changed" (*μεταβεβλήται*).

Taking now the teaching of Calvin as typical of the reformed doctrine transmitted to ourselves, and comparing it with that of the primitive Church, his conception of the manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist seems essentially the same. In Calvin's view, Christ by His Holy Spirit unites us to Himself in the action of the Sacrament, and transfuses to us the virtue of His sacred flesh and blood in our receiving of the consecrated elements, which are "indefinably identified" (to use Dr. Gore's phrase) with His Body and Blood; which elements are indeed to be distinguished from the physical temple of His actually ascended Body, but are not to be divided from it. "Distance of place does not prevent Christ from being present with His people in the Holy Supper" (*Second Defence*, p. 285). "Christ, while remaining in Heaven, descends to us by His virtue" (*Id.* p. 279). "He transfuses the life-giving vigour of His flesh into us" (*Id.*). "The Lord, Who is true, performs inwardly by His Spirit that which the Sacraments figure to the eye; when we distinguish between the signs and the thing signified we do not disjoin the reality from the signs" (*Id.* p. 274). "Christ, though absent in body, is not only present with us by His Divine energy, which is

everywhere diffused, but also makes His flesh give life to us" (*Id.* p. 285). And so on. Calvin is intensely anxious to emphasise the fact that he uses the terms Body and Blood in no ambiguous or figurative sense. He does not mean the *word* of Christ, or the *doctrine*, or the *Church* as His Body. The Body which he means is, he says, "the true and natural body which was offered on the Cross." "I deem it (he says) unlawful to think or speak of any other body than which was offered upon the Cross . . . and has been received into Heaven." He holds it "detestable impiety to imagine Christ with two bodies." "I know, indeed, that the mortal body which Christ once assumed is now endued with new qualities of celestial glory, which, however, do not prevent it from being in substance the same body. I say then" (he goes on) "that by that body which hung on the Cross our souls are invigorated with spiritual life, just as our bodies are nourished by earthly bread. But as distance of place seemsto be an obstacle, preventingthe virtue of Christ's flesh from reaching us, I explain the difficulty by saying that Christ without changing place descends to us by His virtue" (*Id.* p. 200). "We acknowledge without any equivocation that the flesh of Christ gives life . . . we draw life from the flesh once offered in sacrifice" (*Mutual Consent*, p. 238). "From the hidden fountain of the Godhead life was miraculously infused into the body of Christ in order that it might flow thence to us" (*Id.*). He labours to make it evident that he is not speaking metaphorically of an ethical process of edification, by the presentation of the memory of the Passion, or of the truth of the Atonement, or of the doctrine of Christ's

person, nor of a process of receiving the promise by faith (*Id.* p. 284); but of a dynamic operation upon our nature by contact with the glorified nature of Christ's humanity—a vital transmission of its qualities, which is effected by Him through the Holy Ghost.

Calvin accepts as the test of his view the question of the objectivity of the "relation" of the consecrated elements to the Heavenly realities, sacramentally identified with them; which was commonly proposed in the question whether the Body and Blood of Christ was given to the unbelieving Communicant. *Given*—yes; (he replies) but not *received*. "We distinctly declare that no unbelief prevents the sacred ordinance of Christ from retaining its force and nature; prevents His flesh from being offered and given to *all* as spiritual food, and His blood as spiritual drink. . . . If the wicked defraud themselves of this benefit, and their unbelief cause that the fruit does not reach them, we deny that anything is lost to the Sacrament on this account—inasmuch as it remains entire" (*Letter to Churches*, etc., p. 248); or as he writes in the *Mutual Consent* (§ 18), "It is true indeed that Christ with His gifts is offered to all in common, and that, the unbelief of man not overthrowing the truth of God, the Sacraments always retain their efficiency; but all are not capable of receiving Christ and His gifts. Whereupon nothing is changed on the part of God—but in regard to man, each man receives according to the measure of faith."

Calvin guards himself against a local descent of our Lord's natural Body of Ascension—against a

physical enclosure of Christ in the Elements—and against a material contact with Christ in the Sacrament, apart from the spiritual activity and receptiveness of the communicant. These are points on which with endless repetition and toilsome variety of phrase, he labours to be clear of literalism. And who will on these points confess difference from him? One might almost think that Newman had his expressions in memory and that with approval, when he wrote (*Via Media*, II. p. 220), “Our Lord is *in loco* in Heaven; not in the same sense in the Sacrament. He is present in the Sacrament only in Substance (*substantivé*), and substance does not require or imply the occupation of place. Our Lord then neither descends from Heaven upon Altars, nor moves when carried in procession. We can only say that He is present sacramentally. The mixture of His bodily substance with ours is a thing which the ancient Fathers disclaim.”

Calvin says: “Does not this assert a species of presence, that our souls draw life from the flesh of Christ, though in regard to space it is far-distant from us? Westphal cannot bear to have it said that, while wholly remaining in Heaven, Christ descends to us by His virtue. His reason is that the Church believes that wherever the Supper is celebrated His Body is present. Provided he holds the mode of presence which I explained, I object not to this view” (*Def.*, p. 286). As to the term “substance” it is difficult to see a distinction between Newman’s “substance” and Calvin’s “virtue” of Christ’s humanity, or Calvin’s constant teaching that Christ is Himself the Substance of the

Sacrament; while both repudiate with equal clearness the transfusion of Christ's *bodily* substance. "Should any one raise a dispute," says Calvin, "as to the word *substance*, we assert that Christ from the substance of His flesh breathes life into our souls, nay, infuses His own life into us—provided always that no transfusion of substance be imagined."

The standards of our Church follow the same lines of teaching. The *Scots Confession*, 1560: "Notwithstanding the far distance of place which is between His body now glorified in Heaven and us now mortal in this earth, yet we most assuredly believe that the Bread which we break is the Communion of Christ's Body, and the Cup which we bless is the Communion of His Blood; so that we confess and undoubtedly believe that the Faithful in the right use of the Lord's Table so eat the Body and drink the Blood of the Lord Jesus that He remaineth in them and they in Him: yea, they are so made flesh of His flesh and bone of His bones, that as the Eternal Godhead hath given to the flesh of Christ Jesus . . . life and immortality, so doth Christ Jesus, His flesh and blood eaten and drunk by us, give unto us the same prerogatives . . . yea, and further, we affirm that albeit the Faithful oppressed by negligence and many infirmities do not profit so much as they would in the very instant action of the Supper, yet shall it after bring fruit forth, as being seed sown in good ground. For the Holy Spirit, which can never be divided from the right institution of the Lord Jesus, will not frustrate the Faithful of the fruit of that mystical action."

According to the Westminster Standards of 1643 the Elements after Consecration "have such relation to Christ crucified as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the names of the things they represent"; "the Body and Blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in with or under the Bread and Wine; yet as really, but spiritually present to the faith of believers, in that ordinance, as the Elements themselves are to their outward senses." With which may be recalled Calvin's explanation of this use as a safeguard of the phrase "to faith": "The term faith is thus used by us, not to denote some imaginary thing, as if believers only in thought or memory receive what is promised—but only to prevent any one from thinking that Christ is so far made common that unbelievers should enjoy Him" (*Mut. Consent—Exposition of Heads*, p. 238); and also such agreement as Gore expresses when he says that "faith admits to the gift," although "it is not the same thing with the gift" (*B. of C.*, p. 22)—and that "the higher the gift which mere outward participation in the Sacrament . . . puts at our disposal, the more certain it is that only according to our faith will it be done unto us" (*Id.* p. 46). And also, as implying the same condition of true reception, the Invocations of the Spirit in the liturgies, on the worshippers as on the Elements, that the holy things may be for remission of sin and life eternal to all who receive. The doctrinal consent appears to be complete; both as to the objectivity of the supernatural content of the Sacrament, and as to the subjective condition of the reception of that supernatural content.

The presence then in the Sacrament which we find universally confessed is a presence of our Lord Himself—a presence not attached specifically to the Elements, unless in so far as they are essential to its action, but rather a presence assuming to itself both worshippers and elements for the instrumentality of its purpose—a presence in the Sacrament, rather than in this or that of its apparatus, and for the ends of the Sacrament, which at no stage of its progress can be attained by any other ministration than that of Christ Himself: a presence wholly spiritual, in the sense that it is constituted in the efficiency of the Holy Ghost, in Whose fulness the mediating Humanity of our Lord is endowed with what Calvin calls the miraculous power to adopt our fellowship for the sphere of His personal action, and our gifts to supply the form for His fulfilment here of that ministry which in His proper person He fulfils on high—but which, inasmuch as it is thus spiritual, is neither figurative nor metaphysical nor imaginary, nor a subjective condition in ourselves, but is objective and real: the active and conscious and personal presence of Christ—who by the Holy Ghost extends volition and consciousness to the Sacramental *synaxis*, as the brain extends them to the farthest member of the body.

I should for myself be uncertain whether we may speak of any other “presence” than this personal and active presence,—whether in respect of His Sacred Body and Blood we should not rather limit ourselves to the Scriptural and secure statement that the Elements in their use are the Communion of His Body and Blood—whether we should not rather

conceive of them as assumed by the Holy Spirit into a relation to the Incarnate Life of our Saviour, which Gore has happily called one of "indefinable identification," by which they become adequate instruments of His ministry; were it not that the Confession of Faith, following a usage too general to be disregarded, teaches a presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord, although it refuses to define that presence by any phrase ("in, with or under") which implies locality, and insists on faith as the mode of contact with them. This insistence on faith does not minimise the objectivity of the presence thus asserted. Faith (as Calvin has said) is not imagination. It creates nothing. It is receptive. Its object must precede it, in order that faith may be exercised. What it discerns must be there to be discerned—else it is hallucination, not perception. Doubtless it has been a sense of the primary force of our Lord's words of institution, "This is My Body, this is My Blood of the New Testament," which has ruled the Christian mind to a recognition that what He gives in the Sacrament must be itself in the Sacrament.

It is remarkable to note that boldness in affirming this reaches its furthest expression in the words of delivery of the Directory of our own Church: "Take ye, eat ye; this is the Body of Christ, which is broken for you; this Cup is the New Testament in the Blood of Christ, drink ye all of it." Nowhere else, in any ancient liturgy or any office of present use, Eastern or Western, Reformed or Unreformed, with which I am acquainted, is language used so explicit in its identification of the two parts

of the Sacrament, the sign and its gift. Doubtless in this explicitness, unexplained and without comment, our service most closely follows the norm of the Institution itself.

Nevertheless it is impossible to forget that here the two parts of the Sacrament are the Consecrated Elements on the one hand, and the Body and Blood of the Lord on the other; and that these *latter* are the *Spiritual* part, and can be present only by the efficiency of the Holy Spirit—in such manner, that is to say, as Spirit may establish relation between sign and reality. And for my own part I find myself best able to conceive of this no otherwise than as Calvin in numerous places states it—that the virtue and power of the personal Humanity of the Risen Christ are present with the Elements, and are received by us in communicating; not in an ethical manner merely, nor by way of edification—but by contact of force with our nature: not only to move our dispositions of soul by quickened realisation of things believed, nor only to sharpen our volitional grasp of promise, but by infusion of vitality of a higher order, that, namely, of the Life of the Resurrection, which alters the actual subject which in us is offered to the operations of grace and truth.

Passing to consider most briefly practical inferences as to our preparation, celebration, and reception:—inferences from a presence constituted in the Communion of the Holy Ghost, and involving a ministry of our Lord by our means:

(a) Our preparation must stand in the maintenance of that Communion, and in the quickening of our

apprehension of it. "There is no other way," says Calvin, "of Christ's infusing His life into us than by being our Head, from which the whole Body, joined together and connected by every joint of supply, according to His operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the Body" (*Mut. Consent*, p. 226). The rightness of relation, therefore, of the member to the Body, and of the parts of the Body to the whole, cannot be indifferent. It is when men are met "in the Name of Christ" that Christ is there; and His Name is given not taken. There is a primary preparation in regard to this:—namely, an endeavour to ascertain that we meet "in His Name."

There is the habitual preparation of an obedient life, in which the Spirit, through Whom Christ comes to us, is not grieved or quenched. The life is always in the Vine, but not always in the branch. The branch must abide in Christ, and Christ's words abide in it. The keeping of Christ's Commandments, not only of codified morals, but of conformity to His mind—and, above all, His supreme Commandment to believe on Himself—is a condition of fitness for being taken by Christ with Himself into His own activity. It is by the Spirit of Christ in us that we can communicate with Christ giving Himself to us. Discernment of the Lord's Body and feeding upon it is an activity of the *Spiritual* life—that is of Christ in us by the Pentecostal Gift. The Sacramental witness of this truth is that only the baptised may have part in the Eucharist.

It is the constant holding of the Head which prepares us for that immediate preparation in which

we may engage before the actual celebration. Of that immediate preparation two things may be said :

(1) That custom tends too much to represent self-examination as an examination for evil ; for fault, for corrigenda. Scarcely of such examination alone could it be said, " Let a man examine himself, and so let him come." The primary purpose of self-examination may rather be to discern the goodness of our Lord to our unworthiness, and the glory of the place to which He has called us, and the tokens of living communion with Himself, by which He encourages us—to know of what spirit we are, His own Holy and Divine Spirit—and to know our right, in the Body which the Father has prepared for our Lord, to be yielded to Him as instruments for His approach to the Father.

(2) But as this examination must reveal to us our exceeding shortcoming and frequent failure, that we should address ourselves to the task of self-correction in the faith of supernatural resources in this Holy Spirit. There is a fatalistic acceptance of characteristic deficiencies and besetting sins, from which Christian souls have for the most part urgent need to be roused. This or that, we say, is my infirmity—we envy those who are more happily constituted, but for ourselves submit to the disability ; without faith in the power, which, by its communion with the Divine Spirit, the Christian soul possesses, to throw off disability. The remedy for besetting sin is to stop it ; the way of attainment to a lacking grace is to begin to exercise it. Because we call Christ Master and Lord, we are able to do the things that He says.

(3) A third preparation is that of faith. I do not question that meagre views of the Sacrament are compatible with worthy communion. I do not doubt that in this, as in all, Christ is able to do for us, and does for many of us, more than we ask or think—giving us in the Sacrament what some to whom He gives would reckon it superstition to expect, and materialism to desire. Nevertheless, it stands that by faith we receive, and that according to our faith it is done to us—he who sees little in the Sacrament, perhaps only an opportunity of self-profession (to which no Christian instinct impels him), or perhaps only a mechanical stimulus to remember what, he knows, he never forgets—he can have but the less joy in the Sacrament—can offer the less spiritual surface (if one may use the phrase) to contact with Christ's benefits—and certainly must have the less love and longing for it. It is well to be prepared in understanding—it is well that faith be intelligent. Rare communions testify of the need of the preparation of faith—whether in the Church which rarely celebrates, or in the man who rarely communicates.

(b) In regard to the celebration, the effect of viewing it in relation to the Pentecostal Spirit mediated by our Lord, would be to stimulate apprehension of the whole service and action as a Ministry by our Lord in His Humanity towards the Holy Trinity (see Gore, and note, *B. of C.*, p. 103); and to restrain the tendency, characteristic of later developments, to regard it as distinctively a worship of Christ Himself. The tendency of such a view as we endeavour to commend would be against the

identification of the moment of consecration with the constitution of the Presence, and against the identification of the Presence with the Elements locally—and towards elucidating the distinction between Him who hallows and gives, and that which He having hallowed bestows: to hold us to the consciousness that “the Body of Christ” or “the Blood of Christ” is not an equivalent term for Christ Himself—and generally to guard the Christian mind from that rationalistic pressure of logic, by which Romanism has forced itself to impossible and contra-Sacramental inferences. It would prescribe the necessity of “abiding in Christ” throughout the Eucharistic action, and of continuing to act with Him, Who in showing His death does not adore Himself—but shows Himself *to God*, alive from the dead—the Lamb as it had been slain. Such a consciousness of identification with Christ, and of fulfilling for Him His proper acts would bind upon us obedience to the ancient Canon (*C. of Hippo*, A.D. 393, *ap. Gore*), “When we stand at the Altar (Holy Table) let the prayer always be directed to the Father.” It is not impossible that the obscuring of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit by the practical omission from the Petrine liturgies of the Invocation of the Spirit may have had much influence in exposing the Western Church to the development of those lines of thought as to the mode of the Presence which issued in the dogma of transubstantiation, and to those further inferences from that dogma which seem ultimately to conclude that the consecrated element under either species *is* Christ. From every such tendency there is protection in realisation of the whole Sacrament

as that act in which a present Christ takes us up into His own ministry before the Father—in the power of the endless life, ever flowing from the Father to Him as the accepted Mediator, communicating to us the vital force of His Resurrection.

(c) Those who with such a consciousness of yielding their members to Christ in the Sacramental Actions for the fulfilment, on Earth as in Heaven, of His prevailing Ministry—who as joined to the Lord in one Divine Spirit, have advanced through the successive steps of the Eucharist to that point in the Mystery, at which (if our eyes were opened to behold what passes in the Heavenly world in which we stand and act) we should behold the Lord turn from showing His death before God, to us on whose behalf He shows it: and in the power of His perpetual Acceptance and the merit of His once perfected and ever prevailing Sacrifice, holding forth to us His own glorified Humanity, to be the nourishment and sanctification of ours—they, soul to soul, spirit to spirit, flesh to flesh, will offer themselves to Him in the obedience of faith, their whole manhood to contact with His whole Manhood, which radiates upon them the forces of its victory and immortality and holiness: they feed on Him, and them He will raise at the last day.

The Pentecostal Gift in Relation to the
Ministries: The Ascended Lord on
Whose Shoulder is the Government,
and His constant Relation to the
Ministries of His Institution.

REV. PROFESSOR COOPER, D.D.

OUR Ascended Lord, upon Whose shoulder is the Government,¹ is in constant relation to His whole Body, the Church. He is distinct from His Church as He is distinct from His Father; but He is not *separated*, or *divided*, from the Church, as He is not separated or divided from His Father. "I in them," He says, "and Thou in Me."² He is "with us all the days, even unto the end of the world";³ but He is *in us* as well as *with us*, and *in us* He serves and works, and is glorified, or persecuted, or served, to the present hour.

Christ abides not the King only, but (what is much more) the *Head* of the Church: He is the source not alone of her authority, but of her very

¹ Isa. ix. 6.

² S. John xvii. 23.

³ S. Matt. xxviii. 20.

Life. The Sacrament of our entrance into the Church is the Sacrament of our individual *engrafting into Christ*.¹ As Baptism is the Sacrament of our engrafting into Christ, so is the Lord's Supper—the habitual reception of which is the condition of a man's being 'in full communion with the Church'—the Sacrament of the *mutual* (and continual) *indwelling* of Christ in us, and of us in Him. It is thus that He Himself describes beforehand its significance and effect: "He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in Him."² It is as members of Christ that we are members of the Church: it is by abiding in Him, and because He lives, that we have any true life within us. This applies to every Christian. "If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered."³ It is "from" Christ, "the Head," and by holding Him, that "all the body, by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God."⁴

As with the Church's life, so also with her Worship and her Work. The *Worship* of the Church in her highest act is a coming to God in the presentation before the Father of Christ, the "Lamb as It had been slain," now "alive for evermore," and the offering up of herself, as one body, in Him. The *Work* of the Church is to do Christ's work in the world. The Church, as Christ's body, is not merely the sphere in which the fulness of His life is manifested; it is also, in Dr. Milligan's phrase,

¹ *Shorter Catechism*, Qu. 94.

² S. John vi. 56.

³ S. John xv. 6.

⁴ Col. ii. 19.

“the organised instrument of His will”¹ for man’s salvation and His Father’s glory.

To the whole Church, accordingly, is committed alike the duty of Christian Worship and the honour of Christian Work. Those great commands, “This do in remembrance of Me”; “As My Father hath sent Me, so send I you”; “Go, make disciples of all nations, baptising them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you”; “Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained,”² are to be understood as addressed to the Church as a body, and not to her ministers alone. We have but to remember what it is that these commands enjoin, in order to see this. Thus, the clergy may celebrate the Lord’s Supper, but there must be the people also to partake. The clergy may pronounce the excommunication, or the absolution, but it is the members of the Church who have to treat the offender as an outcast, or receive him back among them as a brother, as the case may be. The clergy can no more fulfil these things without the people, than the people without the clergy.

Nay more, let clergy and people be ever so concurrent, these are matters in which, but for the operation with them of a Higher Power, the Divine Head of the Church Himself, their acting must be naught. To what use were *our* baptising with water if Christ did not in the same act baptise with the

¹ *Sermon to Sunday School Teachers in the Presbytery of Dundee.*

² S. John xx. 23.

Holy Ghost? To what effect for men's "spiritual nourishment and growth in grace" were our blessing the bread and breaking it, if we could not count on Christ conveying to us thereby the communion of "His Flesh, which is meat indeed?"¹

The union between Christ and the Church, effected by the Holy Ghost (His Spirit, and the One Spirit of the One Body), must never for one moment be lost sight of, when we think of the Church, or would think aright either of her *standing*, her *privileges*, her *duties*, or her *responsibilities*.

Christ's Ascension into heaven, so far from hindering His Presence with the Church, was the way to it: "He was received up," says the Evangelist, "and they went forth: the Lord working with them, and confirming the Word with signs following."² "He ascended up," adds the Apostle—not that He might leave us but, "that He might fill all things."³

"And" (S. Paul goes on) "He gave some to be apostles; and some to be prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints; unto the work of ministering unto the building up of the Body of Christ, till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Her Ministry, like her work, is given by the

¹ S. John vi. 55.

² S. Mark xvi. 19, 20.

³ Eph. iv. 10. So also when promising the life-giving food of His Flesh and Blood, He connects the gift which He is to give with His Ascension (S. John vi. 62), and Mary Magdalene's profitable "touching" of Him is also to be after He has ascended (S. John xx. 17). See Bp. Andrewes' beautiful sermon on this text.

Ascended Lord : it is given to the Church, and for the Church. It is a GIFT which, like her work, shall continue to the end of time.

It is not something which the Church can evolve, or develop for herself, out of herself. It is the gift to her of Him who is "King in the midst of her."¹ The Ministry is, as truly as the Church herself, a Divine ordinance. "God," says the Apostle, "hath set some in His Church, first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Teachers."²

Just as, in the natural body, God has been pleased to fit it for its various activities, by setting in it eyes and hands and feet by which it sees, and works, and walks ; so in the Body Mystical of Christ. Not only has it its life, through all its members (and all the same life) from God in Christ, and its work assigned to it by Him ; but He who calls it to that work hath given it also "*members in particular*,"³ with their office in the Body, for the Body, and above all for Him for whom the Body itself has its life, and being, and vocation. The membership is the same for all ; but "all" the "members have not the same office."⁴ And the office like the membership is of Christ's creating and appointing.

I know that the natural body may find its eye, its hand, or its foot, become such a minister of evil that, to save its life, it must pluck out that eye or cut off that offending limb. It is better to enter into life halt or maimed than for the whole body to be lost. But the case is an extreme one : and even when it has become absolutely necessary, the body which resorts to such a measure must remain so far dis-

¹ Jer. viii. 19. ² I Cor. xii. 28. ³ Ib. 27. ⁴ Rom. xii. 4.

abled. It can take away the eyes God gave it, or the hands or feet: it cannot develop new ones to replace them.

So with Christ's Body the Church. God hath set in it its Ministries. To reject them were to maim the Body, to maim it of organs which it never could replace, and which, if its work is to be done, it never can dispense with.

It is here that we discern as, on the one hand, the folly and futility, of speaking as if we could separate what God hath joined, the clergy from the laity, or of regarding them as rivals instead of being mutually necessary to each other; so, on the other hand, the importance of that position which we here maintain, that Christ Himself, the ever-living Head of the Church, is Himself the Sender, and Empowerer, of each individual man in the Church's Ministry. That, as the Sacraments become effectual means of salvation, not by any power in themselves, or any virtue derived from "the piety or intention of him by whom they are administered, but only by the working of the Holy Ghost and the blessing of Christ by Whom they are instituted":¹ so in Ordination too, our Saviour is active. It is He that communicates the grace, and gives the authority, and sets the man in his office in the Church. The man may "receive the grace in vain"² in so far as that grace regards his personal salvation. But as regards his ministry, he is set there by Christ; and those who wait upon his ministry with faith in Christ, looking beyond the sinful instrument to Him, and obedient for the sake of Christ, shall not miss the blessing; and shall

¹ *Larger Catechism*, Qu. 162.

² 2 Cor. vi. 1.

even receive it in all its strength and purity, from Christ who is its Giver.

Christ is the True Ordainer. He employs, indeed, the Ministry of men. Even in a case so exceptional as the consecration of SS. Paul and Barnabas for the work whereunto they were called, the laying on of hands could not be dispensed with. The Holy Ghost, as it were, summoned to His aid the Prophets which were at Antioch, and bade them separate the two for Him :¹ which they did, with the outward rites of fasting, prayer, and the imposition of their hands. However Christ may (and does) condition, ordinarily, His bestowal of the office and the grace by the obedience of those to whom doth appertain the authority and exercise of ordination—however needful the outward rite—the power, and the commission, are from Christ. The clergy are the “successors of the *Apostles*” as far, says Principal Hill,² as it is possible for men to be ; but they are not, and they have never been called, the successors of *Christ*. The dead Prophet of Islam may have successors. The Living Christ vouchsafes to use human ministers, agents, officers : but He needs no successor, because He ever liveth, is ever present with His Church, is ever active in and toward it, ever pours His Spirit through all the members of His Body to enable each, as with the gifts they need in common for their personal salvation, so with those which are requisite for the fulfilment of the special office wherein He hath been pleased to set him.

It is, then, to use the words of Bishop Moberly, “no sanctity, or separate authority of their own, that

¹ Acts xiii. 2, 3.

² *View of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland.*

the Ministers of Christ are called to exercise. They are not the delegates of an absent, but the visible representatives of an invisibly present Lord. He was not to go away altogether, though He left them in the flesh ; but He was to be Himself the present, unseen King, even in the long and toilsome days of sorrow and of fasting when the Bridegroom should seem to be taken away from them, and the Church should wait in patience and earnest desire for His reappearing."¹

"Lo ! I am with you all the days unto the end of the world."

What a word this is for the minister of Christ ! Is he conscious what a poor earthly vessel he is himself ? The excellency of the power, let him remember, is of God, and not of him. Does he walk in the midst of trouble ? The Lord stands by him to strengthen him. And let him remember that it is not only for encouragement in his work for Christ that our Lord is with us always, but for the correction and casting down of any high thought that may arise within him. Not only in ministering the Holy Sacraments is he no more than, as it were, the hand of the unseen High Priest. It is so in preaching too. There also—let him be as powerful as S. Paul, as mighty in the Scriptures as Apollos—he will do well to remember that if Paul planted and Apollos watered, it was God that gave the increase.

"O sacerdos, quid es tu ?

Nihil, et omnia."

Nothing in thyself : all, only because Christ is all whose minister thou art.

¹ *The Great Forty Days*, II. 3.

And let the people understand it also. If we magnify our office, it is not for our own sake, but for His who gave us it, and for theirs for whom He giveth it. That they may "account of us as of the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God."¹ That they may come not to us but to Christ who hath appointed us; and may hear us speak to them "as ambassadors for Christ, praying them in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."²

The right doctrine is thus at once the *highest* and the *safest*—safest from any danger of that exaltation of the human agent which is what I suppose men mean when they talk of "Sacerdotalism"; highest because rescuing the Sacred Function from degradation by those weaknesses and sins which are inseparable from its exercise by fallen men, and because ascribing all the glory of whatever success may wait on its fulfilment to "Him Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."³

¹ I Cor. iv. 1.

² 2 Cor. v. 20.

³ I Cor. i. 30.

X The Pentecostal Gift in Relation to the X
Ministries : The Consequent Perpetuity
of the Ministries, and the necessity of
a valid Ordination thereto.

REV. S. J. RAMSAY SIBBALD, B.D., CRATHIE.

S. MATTHEW, at the close of his Gospel, and S. Luke, in the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, present two views of the commission which the Ascending Lord gave to those who had "compained with Him." These two views are essentially one and the same. To make disciples of all nations, as S. Matthew writes, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and teaching them to observe whatsoever He had commanded, is identical with the function of "witnessing," of which S. Luke speaks. Nor is the source of the power which was to enable them to fulfil this duty represented differently by the two Evangelists : "All power is given unto Me,"¹ unto Christ ; the power is therefore the power of Christ, bestowed through the Holy Spirit : "Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you";²

¹S. Matt. xxviii. 18.

²Acts i. 8.

the Spirit is sent by the Father, in the Son's name. In accordance with this, S. Paul represents the gift of ministries as being bestowed by the ascended and glorified Lord : "when He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men" (how striking is the Gospel conception of lordship, which led S. Paul to alter the words of the quotation);¹ "and He gave some, apostles, and some, prophets, and some, evangelists, and some, pastors and teachers." That this relation of the ascended Lord through the Spirit to the ministries instituted by Him is a constant relation, is evident from what S. Paul goes on to say : "For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." And he speaks of the Body as growing and increasing from Christ as its Head. The ministries are given for that growth and increase, for that perfecting and edifying, and so long as that process goes on, the ministries must endure, receiving the fulfilment of the promise, "Lo, I am with you alway."

It is questionable how far the ministries here indicated represent Orders or the degrees in rank of ministers. S. Paul certainly speaks as if these gifts were bestowed upon different classes of men, who each contributed their peculiar service to the edification of the Church. But, on the other hand, he speaks also as if one man might exercise at different times the functions of more than one of these classes. He

¹ Cf. Ps. lxxviii. 18; Eph. iv. 8.

speaks of himself as a preacher and an apostle ; and he charges Timothy, as pastor, as teacher, as bishop, and as evangelist. But although these ranks of ministry were not to remain perpetually as Orders; the *functions* are to remain, being discharged, as the Spirit may direct, and as need may require, by men called to minister in the Church.

The Gospel ministry is not, as the one-sided popular view so frequently supposes, a ministry of preaching alone ; it is a ministry also of intercession, of benediction, of government, and of the sacraments. The ministry of preaching, and, to a certain extent, that of intercession, is not limited to a special order, but may and ought to be exercised by all members of the Church, in such ways as their vocation, and their attainments, mental and spiritual, make advantageous. "I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied" (1 Cor. xiv. 5). Nor would the ministry of government, and the ministry of the sacraments, if they were merely matters of expediency, be confined to any class specially set apart, but would be only regulated and supervised by the Church as a whole. But, so far as Scriptural Authority goes, these were committed, not to all the members of the Church either individually or collectively, but to certain men, who were "chosen" and "ordained." The "This do ye" of the Lord's Supper was spoken to the Apostles, not to the whole body of the faithful ; the Apostolic commission, including the function of "teaching" and "preaching the Gospel," as distinct from mere preaching or prophesying, was given to the "Apostles whom He had chosen" (Acts i. 2). The

distinction thus instituted by our Lord Himself was recognised and acted upon by the Apostles, and has remained in the Church to this day. The function of government does not, obviously, emerge during our Lord's earthly life and ministry; though in preparation for His ascension He commits to the Apostles the power of the keys, and invests them with the mission which He had Himself received: "as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you" (S. John xx. 21). From these and other passages it appears that while there is a vocation common to all the members of the Church to minister both by speech and example, and by prayer for themselves and others, there are laid upon those specially appointed the duties of government, of ministering the sacraments, and of public authoritative utterance. The last of these, probably on account of its affinity with the general ministry of preaching and prayer, was permitted to the deacon, and added to his other duties, as was also that of baptising (Acts vi.); but the others, the function of ministering the Lord's Supper, and of government, of ordination to the sacred ministries, and of authoritative teaching—these were committed to presbyters, acting individually in the first and last of these, and conjointly in the work of government, and in the act of ordination. The thorny question of the development of the Episcopate does not necessarily arise here. General assent will be accorded to the opinion which the Bishop of Worcester states thus: "In any case, it is certain that the development of the ministry occurred on the principle of the Apostolic succession. Those who were to be ministers were the elect of the Church in which

they were to minister ; but they were authoritatively ordained to their office from above, and by succession from the Apostolic men " (Gore, *Ep. to Ephesians*, p. 171).

It is almost unnecessary to recall the Scriptural authority for saying that a valid ordination to the Holy Ministry is necessary. On this point the standards of our own Church are clear and decided. "No man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the Gospel, until he be lawfully called and ordained thereto": "Ordination is the act of a presbytery": "Every minister of the Word is to be ordained by imposition of hands and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong": "Preaching presbyters orderly associated, are those to whom the Imposition of Hands doth appertain" (*Form of Church Government*). "Because no man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the Word without a lawful call, therefore Ordination, which is the solemn setting apart of a person, unto some public Church office, is always to be continued in the Church. When he who is to be ordained Minister hath been first duly examined. . . . He is then to be ordained by Imposition of Hands and Prayer with Fasting. . . . Ordination is the act of a presbytery, unto which the power of ordering the whole work belongs: yet so as that the preaching presbyters, orderly associated, either in cities or in neighbouring villages, are those to whom the Imposition of Hands doth appertain, for those congregations within their bounds respectively" (*Directory*, Cf. Ordination of Ministers).

In face of the authority of Scripture, the practice

of the Apostles, and the law of the Church, the necessity of a valid ordination will not be seriously called in question. The question on which difference of opinion will be most marked is, naturally, as to what constitutes a valid ordination. The Scottish Church admits Episcopal as well as Presbyterian ordination to be valid, while maintaining that it is through presbyters, headed by a bishop, or by a moderator, that the succession has been transmitted from the Apostles to ourselves.¹ (Cf. Dr. Sprott's *Sermon* on the necessity of a valid ordination to the Holy Ministry.)

The whole subject of orders is one that cannot be adequately treated in a few papers: it is one on

¹ I should wish to emphasise the fact that according to the *Directory*, according therefore to the present belief and practice of the Church, "ordination is to be the act of a presbytery," not of a fortuitous concourse of presbyters: "the preaching presbyters, *orderly associated*, are those to whom the imposition of hands doth appertain." It is open to question whether we give sufficient force to the words "orderly associated." They must mean "associated in accordance with the order of the Church, which has arranged and fixed the division of presbyteries." Dr. Sprott, in his recent valuable lecture on the "Doctrine of Schism in the Church of Scotland" (p. 34) refers to the case of a Cameronian, deposed by his presbytery and declared by the Commission of Assembly to be "not of the communion of this Church," who associated with him another deposed schismatic and some laymen, and proceeded to ordain: and says, "As orders are indelible, the ordination (*i.e.* of those ordained by the self-constituted and so-called presbytery) must be held valid." With all deference to Dr. Sprott's authority, one may ask whether these "preaching presbyters," who thus assumed the right to confer orders, were "orderly associated": and if the ordination conferred in the absence of this condition was valid. The same line of argument has an application into which I shall not enter, to the much more important schism of 1843: and it has a bearing, too apt to be lost sight of, on the present question of Church Union.

which clergy and people alike have thought too little; in view of a possibility much to be desired, a reconstructed or rather united and compacted British Church, it is one on which attention must be much more largely bestowed. Meanwhile, this Society has shown its fidelity to Scriptural and Apostolic practice, not less than to the standards of the Church, by giving "the necessity of a valid ordination" a prominent place among the objects for which it contends.

Ordination as in Holy Scripture, and in the Post-Apostolic Age.

REV. PROFESSOR COOPER, D.D.

THE Church of Scotland, in common with the rest of the Catholic Church, believes not only that the "Catholic Visible Church" is a creation and ordinance of GOD, "His House and Family, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation"; but also that to this Church "CHRIST hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of GOD, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by His own Presence and SPIRIT, according to His promise, make them effectual thereto."¹ It believes further that "Ordination is always to be continued in the Church," and that "every minister of the Word is to be ordained by the imposition of hands and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong."² On our theory that bishops and presbyters, however different their rank, are really of one and the same *Order* in the Church, Episcopal ordination is really,

Confession of Faith, cap. xxv.

² *Form of Church Government*.

✓ ordination “by preaching presbyters”; and therefore the Westminster Divines declare explicitly that “the form of ordination which hath been” (before 1645) “in the Church of England, we hold to be for substance valid, and therefore not to be disclaimed by any who have received it.”¹

The Church of Scotland is bound, as much as the Church of England is, to the *principle* of “Apostolical Succession”; though we hold it in a form which, we believe, delivers it from many of those objections to which, in its extreme Anglican shape, it lies exposed. Take for example the historical objection formulated by Lord Macaulay.² That historian dwells on the number of bishops who, in the Dark Ages were minors, heretics, or unconsecrated persons—who were on various grounds incompetent ordainers. But if the presbyters who (according to a Western custom still observed in the Church of England)³ were associated with those bishops in the act of ordination, were (as we hold) as competent to ordain as the most canonically consecrated bishop, and were, in point of fact co-ordiners, any defects in his qualification were remedied by their co-operation.

The particular texts which the Westminster divines appeal to in support of these doctrines are

¹ *Form of Church Government.*

² Macaulay's *Essays: Gladstone on Church and State.*

³ See *Book of Common Prayer* Ordering of Priests, where the rubric runs, “The Bishop *with the Priests present* shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the Order of Priesthood.” In the Greek Church at the present day it is the Bishop only who lays on his hands; but anciently if the Bishop alone did that ‘all the presbyters’ ‘touched’ and ‘held’ him. See *Testament of our Lord*, pp. 90, 91, and Note.

Titus i. 5 ("For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest ordain elders in every city"—*καταστήσης κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους*); 1 Timothy v. 22 ("Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins"—*χείρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει*); Acts xiv. 23 ("And when they had ordained them" (R.V. "appointed for them") "elders in every church"—*χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν*); and Acts xiii. 3 ("And when they had fasted, and prayed, they laid their hands on them"—*ἐπιτιθέντες τὰς χείρας αὐτοῖς*). To which we may add 1 Tim. iv. 14 ("The gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery"—*χαρίσματος ὃ ἐδόθη σοι διὰ προφητείας μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*) compared with 2 Tim. i. 6 ("The gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands"—*διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου*). These seem sufficient to establish the *rite* by which ordination with its characteristic gift was given, to have been the laying on of the hands of those who were already at least in the rank of presbyters: however they may have been, like the prophets at Antioch, and S. Paul when he presided at S. Timothy's ordination, endued also of the higher, and as our Standards call it "extraordinary," ministry as well. It may indeed be that, when Timothy is bidden lay hands suddenly on no man, the reference is not so much to Ordination, as to that other imposition of hands which was employed to signify the complete reconciliation of an offending but repentant brother. It occurs, however, in a section of the Epistle dealing with presbyters (v. 17); and it has usually been

taken of Ordination ;¹ while an objection that has been urged against the great passage in Acts xiv. 23, that the word χειροτονήσαντες there employed describes an act of the people—the congregation *stretching forth their hands to vote for this man* or for that, seems to me quite incompatible with the context. The word occurs in a narrative of a series of acts which the Apostles, Paul and Barnabas, performed in the course of their return journey from Derbe to Lystra, Iconium and the Pisidian Antioch. They came “confirming the souls of the disciples, exhorting them to continue in the Faith, and that through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God. And when they had appointed (χειροτονήσαντες) elders in every Church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they had believed.”² It was the Apostles, unquestionably, who did every thing else in this long list of acts—they who “confirmed the souls of the disciples,” who “exhorted them,” who “prayed with fasting,” and who “commended them to the Lord” : it would surely be unnatural to introduce *new agents* in the central act of all ; for an act, of which in the case of Timothy, S. Paul was certainly the chief officiant. I know that there is a passage in the *Didachè*, or *Teaching of the Twelve*, where the same

¹ Upon it is based, no doubt, the first word put into the mouth of the Bishop in the Form for the Ordering of Deacons and Priests (“Take heed that the persons whom ye present be apt and meet . . . to exercise their Ministry only, etc.”) ; and it is expressly cited in that for Ordaining or Consecrating an Archbishop or Bishop (“Forasmuch as the Holy Scripture . . . command that we should not be hasty in laying on hands”) in the Book of Common Prayer.

² Acts xiv. 21-23.

verb (χειροτονήσατε)¹ seems, at first sight, clearly to be an exhortation to the people *Stretch forth your hand to vote for* bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord"; but the apparently obvious meaning is not always the true one. The Didachè, it should be remembered, is a Manual for the clergy—a Church Order, though a poor one. And will any one say that SS. Paul and Barnabas when they appointed elders in every "Church," took a vote between themselves whom they should appoint? If the Apostles (as I contend the text in Acts must mean) stretched out their hands, it was to lay them on the heads of the men whom they appointed, and convey to them the Gift—the Charisma—of Orders, to fit them for the work whereunto they had been called.

It was thus that the Twelve had acted at the Ordination of the Seven,² the people voted for the men whom they believed to be suitable. The *Apostles* "appointed" them, and did so by prayer and the laying on of their hands. The order observed in the Ordination of the Seven is given by S. Luke, it seems clear, as exhibiting once for all—though in an appointment to an inferior office—the principles that must rule in every ordination. So far, the Church of Scotland and the Church of England are agreed. Nor does it seem needful, at the present day, to insist upon the fact—admitted now on all hands—that, in the New Testament, the

¹ Didachè xv. 1.

² Acts vi. 3-6. See the Declaratory Act of the General Assembly, 1698, for Vindication of the Church of Scotland from the Calumny of Thomas Gipps, Rector of Barry, declaring that "they allow no power in the People but only in the Pastors of the Church to appoint or ordain Church-officers."

Identity of
Presbyters
and
Bishops

same persons are called sometimes 'Bishops' and sometimes Presbyters. The Presbyters of the Church of Ephesus whom S. Paul summoned to meet him at Miletus are exhorted by him to "take heed unto themselves and to all the flock in the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops";¹ the "bishops" who are associated with "the deacons" at Philippi in S. Paul's Epistle to that much-loved Church,² were certainly presbyters and not prelates; the 'bishops' of third chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy are the 'elders' of the fifth chapter. And curiously enough when Apostles—the highest order in what our fathers called the Extraordinary, and modern writers call the Ambulatory, Ministry—speak of themselves as sharing also the Ordinary, or Local, Ministry it is 'Presbyters' they call themselves, not 'Bishops.'³

Current
of
Time

The most notable single document of the Post-Apostolic Age is unquestionably the *Epistle from the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth*,⁴ an Epistle which bears, as is no doubt correctly believed, the name of that Clement whom S. Paul described as one of his fellow-labourers, whose names are in the Book of Life.⁵ That Epistle, we contend, makes for the government of the Church (at the time when it was written) both at Rome and Corinth, being in the hands of a Presbytery—a College of Presbyter-Bishops—rather than of a single Bishop; but as to *the principle of Succession in the Ministry*, and of that Succession having *begun from the Apostles* and

¹ Acts.² Phil. i. 1.³ 1 S. Peter v. 1; 2 S. John i.; 3 S. John i.⁴ *First Epistle of S. Clement.*⁵ Phil. iv. 3.

been brought down from their day, it is as clear as our own Standards. "The Apostles received the Gospel for us from the Lord JESUS CHRIST; JESUS CHRIST was sent forth from God. . . . Having received a charge . . . they went forth, and . . . preaching everywhere, . . . they appointed their first-fruits, when they had proved them by the SPIRIT, to be Bishops and Deacons unto them that should believe. And this they did, not as a novel invention; for indeed it had been written concerning Bishops and Deacons from very ancient times; for thus saith the Scripture in a certain place, *I will appoint their Bishops in righteousness and their Deacons in faith*¹ And our Apostles knew through our Lord JESUS CHRIST that there would be strife over the name of the Bishop's office. For this cause therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the aforesaid persons, and afterwards they appointed a continuance that, if these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed (*διαδέξωνται*) to their ministration. Those therefore who were appointed by them, or afterwards by other men of repute (*ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν*) with the consent of the whole Church, and have ministered (*λειτουργήσαντες*) unblameably to the Flock of Christ in lowliness of mind, peacefully and with all modesty, and for long time have borne a good report with all—these men we consider to be unjustly thrust out from their ministration (*λειτουργίας*). For it will be no light sin for us, if we thrust out those who have offered the gifts of the bishop's office (*προσενεγκόντας τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς*) unblameably and holily."²

¹ *First Ep. of S. Clem.* chap. 42.

² *Ib.* chapter 44.

S. Clement, it is true, does not specify the *rite*¹ or *form* which the Apostles and their successors used in appointing Bishops, or Presbyters, and Deacons; but there can be no doubt that it was by the laying on of hands, by those who were already in the ministry, with prayer and fasting, that in the Sub-Apostolic Age the Ministerial succession was continued.

There remains a third point. By whom was the Ordination given?

Was it (1) by the Ambulatory Ministry, which, beginning with the Twelve themselves, included also others like SS. Paul, Barnabas, and Silas, as well as such Apostolic vicars as SS. Timothy and Titus, those Christian *Prophets* who figure so largely in the pages of the *Didachè*, or those *Evangelists* of whom Eusebius tells us: that "being filled with the desire to preach Christ to those who had not yet heard the word of faith, and to deliver to them the

¹The word (χειροτονήσατε) which occurs in the *Didachè* or *Teaching of the Twelve*, is (it has been contended) an exhortation to the people—"Stretch forth your hand to vote for bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord" (*Didachè*, xv. 1). But the same interpretation, when put upon the same word in Acts xvi. 23, is shewn to be untenable by the fact that *there* it describes not the act of the congregation, but one of a series of acts performed by the two Apostles, SS. Paul and Barnabas. It was they, certainly, who *confirmed the souls of the disciples, exhorted them to continue in the faith, prayed with fasting, and commended them to the Lord on whom they had believed*. It was they, therefore, who stretched out their hands to appoint the presbyters, whom they constituted in *every Church*. SS. Paul and Barnabas certainly did not do that as *voting* for this man or that. They stretched out their hands to lay them on the heads of the men whom they appointed, and to convey to them the Gift—the Charisma—of Orders, to fit them for the work whereunto they had been called.

divine gospels, when they had only laid the foundation of the faith in foreign places, they appointed others as pastors . . . while they went on to other countries . . . doing wonderful works in the power of the Spirit?"¹ Did this Ambulatory Ministry—ere ceasing to exist, as it soon did—establish in every Church a Monarchical Bishop, lifting him by special consecration out of the Order of Presbyters, and setting him permanently as a pastor over other pastors, as well as over the congregation? Or (2) were those Monarchical Bishops who ultimately came to be, all the world over, the recognised rulers of the Church, elevated, originally, to their pre-eminence *by the Presbyters* over whom they were henceforth to preside? And (3) was there always, in the Sub-Apostolic Age, a permanent president, so raised above the ordinary Presbyters that without such there could be no Church?

We need have no hesitation in acknowledging that the Ambulatory Ministry—which, while it existed, was "able to supply such general control as made it unnecessary for each community to have an independent and permanent head"—took a share in the inauguration of the movement which ended in the establishment of the Monarchical Episcopate throughout the Church as a normal feature in its government. The Apostles themselves are shewn to us in the Acts as acquiescing in the position which S. James held in the Mother Church of all, the Church of Jerusalem—a position which is, to say the least, strongly suggestive of that of the Monarchical bishop.² We read that, on S. James's

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 37.

² Acts xv. 6-22 ; xxi. 18.

martyrdom, the surviving Apostles assembled at Jerusalem, and appointed Symeon to be Bishop in his room, and so the Episcopal succession was established there.¹ At Antioch, the first seat of Gentile Christianity, there is also early evidence of such a Bishop ; while over the East generally, and very especially in Asia Minor, where S. John lived long and ruled, the system was established so early, so firmly, so universally, that we cannot but admit that the Beloved Apostle must have at least allowed it.

Yet while—as the Epistles of S. Ignatius most unquestionably prove—the Christian Ministry in each Church throughout the Christian East, so early as the first decade of the Second Century (S. Ignatius' martyrdom is dated A.D. 110) is constituted in a Bishop, a council of Presbyters, and Deacons ; there is at the same time no evidence either (1) that, in every case the first Bishop of the see had his *elevation over his fellow Presbyters*, as distinguished from his *ordination*, at the hands of the Ambulatory Ministry, or (2) that, in any case his elevation was marked by such a consecration as implied the raising of him to a different Order in the Ministry. There are not wanting indications even in the Epistles of S. Ignatius himself, that the Bishop is one of a body of Presbyters, though the most distinguished in that body ; and though nothing is to be done without him, he can delegate his powers. "That is a valid Eucharist," says S. Ignatius, "which the Presbyters celebrate by his permission : in short, *whatever he shall approve of*, that also is well-pleasing to God,

¹ Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* III. xi.

safe, and valid.”¹ “As the strings to the lyre, so are the presbyters to the bishop.”²

But when we turn from the East to the West we are confronted by very different phenomena. It is not too much to say that in the sub-Apostolic Age we can prove the non-existence of the Monarchical Episcopate in the great Apostolic Churches of Corinth and Rome, and in the equally great and famous Church of Alexandria, and in the Apostolic, though less famous Church of Philippi.³ There were Bishops and Deacons in all those Churches, and the Bishops were the successors of the Apostles or their deputies; but (as in the New Testament) the Bishops are Presbyters and the Presbyters are Bishops: they may have a President, but it is not he but they that rule the Church. They rule it as a College of Bishops, or as a Presbytery, not as the mere advisers, even the constitutional advisers, of a single Prelate.

There was no Prelatical or Monarchical Bishop at Corinth when S. Clement wrote to the Church of Corinth in the name of the Church of Rome. There is nothing to show that the absence of such a Bishop was due to a temporary vacancy in the See. Nay, there was no such Bishop at Rome itself. There is no trace of him in Clement. There is no trace of him even in Ignatius. Nothing is more remarkable in the Epistles of that Saint than the contrast between his

¹ *Ep. ad Smyrn.* viii.

² *Ep. ad Ephes.* iv.

³ “In Palestine, Syria, and Proconsular Asia, the three orders, as orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, existed from the time of the Apostles: in some other parts, especially at Rome and at Alexandria, *there were at first only two orders.*” The Bishop of Salisbury, *Ministry of Grace*, p. 142.

strong exhortations to the Asiatic Churches to obey their Bishop as JESUS CHRIST, and the entire absence of any reference whatever to a Bishop, so much as existing in the Church of Rome. Yet the Church of Rome is a Church, as well as those of Asia, it 'hath obtained mercy from the Majesty of the Most High,' it is 'illuminated in all the will of Him who willeth all things . . . it hath taught others.'¹

As S. Ignatius was being conveyed a prisoner from Asia to Rome, he was welcomed, and escorted on his way by the first Church which S. Paul had planted on the soil of Europe, and which, when the Apostle wrote to it from Rome his Epistle to the Philippians, was under the government of "the bishops and deacons"; and very soon after that visit—so soon that the details of the martyr's death had not had time to reach his friends at Smyrna—S. Polycarp, the youthful Bishop of Smyrna, a Monarchical Bishop if ever there was one, wrote an Epistle to the Church of Philippi. It is a formal, official document—"Polycarp and his Presbyters to the Church of Philippi." It treats that Church as a Church, the same Church which S. Paul had planted.² It mentions 'the widows': it exhorts the Deacons to "be diligent after the pattern of Christ, who was the chief of deacons."³ It bids the people be "subject to the Presbyters and Deacons,"³ and the Presbyters to be good shepherds of the erring and the sick, and to hold aloof from all false brethren and hypocrites.⁴ But it *never so much as refers to*

¹ *Ep. ad Rom.* Address I. iii.

² *Ep. Polycarpi*, iii.

³ *Ib.* v.

⁴ *Ib.* vi.

any Bishop having authority over those Deacons and Presbyters. "The contrast here," says Bishop Lightfoot, "to the language of Ignatius, is not less significant than the resemblance. It is the 'Bishops,' not the 'Presbyters,' who stand in God's place in Ignatius. Either therefore there was no Bishop at Philippi when Polycarp wrote, or Polycarp did not think fit to separate his claims to allegiance from those of the Presbyters."¹

Pass over twenty years, and still we find at Rome no Prelatical Bishop. In the *Shepherd of Hermas*, written about A.D. 140, "we find," says the Bishop of Salisbury, "a condition of things still implied like that implied in (S. Clement's) letter to the Corinthians. Government is by a body of Presbyters to whom 'everything' is to be referred." "The beginning of the change," the Bishop goes on, "dates from the time of Pius (140-163); and so late as about 200, in the *Church Order* which bears the name of Hippolytus, we find two remarkable rules: first, that one of the Bishops and Presbyters is to be chosen

¹ *Apostolic Fathers*, ii. 2, p. 916. I submit that in view of S. Ignatius' own Epistle to the Romans, of his acceptance of the ministrations of the Philippians, and of S. Polycarp's Epistle, there seems much more force in Bp. Lightfoot's opinion that "There is no indication (even) in S. Ignatius that he is upholding the Episcopal as against any other form of Church government, as for instance the Presbyteral. . . . If Ignatius had been writing to a Church which was under Presbyteral government, he would doubtless have required submission 'to the Presbyters and Deacons.' As it is, he is dealing with communities where Episcopacy had been already matured, and therefore he demands obedience to their Bishops,"—than there is in the contrary contention of Bp. Gore: "It seems to me as clear as day that Ignatius regarded Episcopacy as universal, and the only legitimate form of Church government."

to say the prayer, and to lay hands upon the person to be ordained ; and second, that the same prayer is to be used both for a Bishop and Presbyter, but with only a change in the title." Then it is added that "the power of Ordination is not given to the Presbyter"—which "looks," says Bishop Wordsworth, "as if the prerogatives implied by the two titles were now being distinguished, while as yet this distinction had not been carried very far." If a Deacon was elected to the See he was not first ordained Presbyter and then Bishop: he was ordained Bishop with the same form as would have been used had he been raised to the Presbyterate, with only the title of his office altered." In Alexandria too, "from the time of S. Mark to that of Bishops Heraclas (233-249) and Dionysius (249-265) the Presbyters always nominated as Bishop one chosen out of their own body, and placed in a higher grade just as if an army were to appoint a general, or Deacons were to chose from their own body one whom they knew to be diligent and to call him Archdeacon." So says S. Jerome ; Morinus understands him to mean that no further ordination (or consecration) was needed for the Presbyter selected ; and the Bishop of Salisbury believes "that Morinus is right as regards Rome and Alexandria"¹ up to the beginning or middle of the third century.

This means that in the West, at any rate, the Historic Episcopate arose out of the Presbyterate ; that it has its succession from the Apostles only through the Presbyterate and not by an independent channel ; and that an ordination, which comes

¹ *Ministry of Grace*, p. 136.

through an unbroken line of Presbyters—though however irregular according to later ideas—is yet a valid ordination. If Presbyter-bishops could create out of their own number a Bishop of Rome, and a Patriarch of Alexandria, they can—not acting separately and independently, as Colluthus did,¹ but unitedly as a Presbytery—ordain Presbyters entitled to rule and minister in any part of the Church of God whereto they may be orderly appointed.

¹ “Colluthus is known in Church history as the man in whose person, the ‘leading case,’ so to call it, respecting the validity of Presbyterian ordination was decided in the year before the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 324. . . . If we may fairly give so much credit to Eutychius as to suppose that (the Bishop) Alexander had in some degree abridged the rights of the City-presbyters, and enlarged those of his comprovincial Bishops, and if Colluthus claimed, as is probable, to exercise in his own church some of the episcopal rights implied by Jerome, we can easily understand the grounds of his schismatical action” (that of ordaining Ischyrras and others, who were afterwards decided to be mere laymen). “Yet as *Colluthus evidently acted alone*, Alexander as evidently had a good case against him, even allowing the utmost latitude to the collegiate privileges of the Alexandrian Presbyterate.” *Ministry of Grace*, p. 139. ‘Orders’ conferred by one Presbyter ‘acting alone’—in defiance of and opposition to, the presbytery of which he is a collegiate member—are no less contrary to Presbyterian principles than they are to those of Episcopacy. The case of Colluthus is irrelevant in the case of the Church of Scotland.

Ordination : Doctrine and Practice of the Reformation, and of the Reformed Churches.

REV. G. W. SPROTT, D.D.

IT was the common doctrine of the Medieval Church and of learned men at that time almost without exception that Bishop and Presbyter formed but one order of the Ministry, that in the first ages churches were governed by the Common Councils of Presbyters and that the Episcopate was developed out of the Presbyterate. I shall quote the testimony of one or two medievalists on this point and of Erasmus, who is usually regarded as the most learned man of his time.

"The Scots," says Fordoun, a priest of the Diocese of St. Andrews, *c.* 1300, "before the coming of Palladius in 431, had doctors of the Faith and ministers of the Sacraments who were Presbyters only or monks following the rites of the primitive Church." John Major, the last of the Schoolmen and a man of great erudition, says that "during these 200 years the Scots were nourished in the Faith by Presbyters and monks, without bishops."

These writers were in error with regard to Palladius, whose mission was to the Scots in Ireland, but this does not affect their belief that the Church was at first governed by Presbyters and that the Episcopate was a later development.

The words of Erasmus are: "Each Presbytery (*i.e.* in primitive times) chose one of its members as president to prevent division. Bishops similarly found it expedient to have a chief bishop to check rivalries and to defend the Church against the secular power." Thus his opinion was that bishops did not differ in order from presbyters, any more than archbishops differed in order from bishops.

I. All the Reformed Churches, therefore, as a matter of course, accepted the position that the Episcopate was not a separate order by Divine right. Luther and his coadjutors taught the same doctrine, and on several occasions he along with other presbyters consecrated bishops, following as he believed the custom of the primitive Church, and specially of the Church of Alexandria. Zwingli was also of the same opinion and Calvin in his *Institutes*, published in 1536, says that bishop and presbyter are synonymous, that the presbyters in every city selected one of their number to whom they gave the special title of bishop, lest divisions should arise, and that the ancients themselves confessed that this practice was introduced by human arrangement. It was held accordingly in all the Reformed Churches that the power of ordination belonged to presbyters by Divine right, and that bishops were not necessary to carry on the succession in the ministry.

The Confession of the French Reformed Church

adopted in 1559 says: "We believe that it is not lawful for any man of his own authority to take upon himself the government of the Church, but that everyone ought to be admitted thereunto by a lawful election if it may possibly be done;" and among their canons it was enacted "that the election of Ministers shall be conducted by prayer and imposition of hands and that two pastors (shall be) deputed by the Synod or Colloquy to lay their hands upon the minister elect."

In the Scottish Confession of 1560 it is declared that the notes of the true Church of God are first the true preaching of the word, secondly the right administration of the Sacraments, and lastly ecclesiastical discipline uprightly ministered as God's word prescribeth, and it is further stated that "lineal descent from a perpetual succession of bishops is not a mark of the true Church" (see Latin version).

In the latter Confession of Helvetia drawn up in 1566, and approved not only by the Swiss Churches but by the Churches of Savoy, Poland, Hungary, and Scotland, it is said that "the Apostles ordained pastors and teachers in all Churches by the commandment of Christ, who by such as succeeded them have taught and governed the Church unto this day.... Furthermore no man ought to usurp the honour of the ecclesiastical ministry. But let the Ministers of the Church be called and chosen by a lawful and ecclesiastical election and vocation. . . . And those which are chosen let them be ordained of the elders (presbyters) with public prayer and laying on of hands. We do therefore condemn all those which

run of their own accord, being neither chosen, sent, nor ordained."

II. The Reformed Churches believed in the necessity of apostolic succession through presbyters, or bishops acting in that capacity. This is not taught so expressly by the Reformed as by the Westminster Divines and other presbyterians in the 17th century, but it is a fair inference from their doctrine and practice. They maintained that God had preserved a valid baptism and ordination in the Church of Rome, and in all Reformed countries the leaders of the Reformation were men in holy orders. Saravia, the friend of Hooker, speaking of the French Reformed clergy at the conference of Poissy in 1561, says: "Although they had not all received the same kind of ordination, some having been ordained by bishops of the Roman Church, others by the Reformed Churches, none of them should have been ashamed of his orders. They might all have avowed quite safely, so far as I can see, that they had been ordained and called, some by bishops of the Roman Church, others by orthodox presbyters, the ordination being received in the churches of Christ, and accompanied with imposition of hands and prayer."

Calvin held that the ordination of presbyters was a sacrament for a particular order of men, and that the celebration of sacraments (this among the number) belonged to ministers only.

The Church of Scotland claimed to have been reformed by presbyters, though there were undoubtedly some bishops, regularly consecrated, among them. Our Reformers held the strictest views as to the necessity of a lawful call to the Ministry. In the

first Book of Discipline it is said : " Some dare now be so bold as without all vocation to minister, as they suppose, the true sacraments in open assemblies. . . . This contempt proceeds no doubt from the malice and craft of that serpent who first deceived man, of purpose to deface the glory of Christ's evangel and to bring the blessed sacraments into contempt. . . . If he who doth falsify the seal, subscription, or coin of a king is judged worthy of death, what shall we think of him who plainly doth falsify the seal of Christ Jesus who is the King of the kings of the earth ? . . . We require that sharp laws may be made against . . . such as dare presume to minister the sacraments not orderly called to that office, lest the wrath of God be kindled against the whole."

It had previously been stated in that book that the "admission of ministers to their offices must consist in the consent of the people and church whereunto they shall be appointed, and approbation of the learned ministers appointed for their examination." And it was added : " Other ceremony than the public approbation of the people and declaration of the chief minister that the person there presented is appointed to serve the Church we cannot approve, for albeit the Apostles used imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased the using of the ceremony we judge not necessary." This is certainly a remarkable statement, and it is worthy of note that there is no reference even to the offering of prayer on the occasion. Account for it as we may, it was not the dictum of the Church, for the first Book of Discipline never received ecclesiastical sanction, and there is no evidence of its having been ever acted on.

In 1566 the Church approved the Second Helvetic Confession, which requires the laying on of hands, and a form of ordination now lost was presented by the General Assembly in 1570, which the bishops of 1620 refer to as satisfactory. We know that ordination with imposition of hands was the custom of the Church before 1574, and the second Book of Discipline, drawn up in 1577, makes the ceremony essential. Patrick Forbes of Corse, minister of Keith, afterwards Bishop of Aberdeen, writing before 1612 in defence of the orders of the Reformed clergy, says that "our adversaries are more than impudent to deny our ordinary vocation."

III. The Reformers did not object to Episcopacy so long as bishops were not regarded as a separate order by Divine right. While holding the equality of Presbyters in office power, they admitted the lawfulness of an inequality in rank for purposes of order, efficiency, and unity, and some of them considered such inequality as of Apostolic institution. It is not inconsistent with Presbyterianism to hold that, while bishop and presbyter are the same in order, permanent presidentship, with considerable powers, began in some parts of the Church under apostolic direction. Several of the Reformed Churches had superintendents who discharged episcopal functions. John A. Lasco, who was Superintendent of the Foreign Reformed Churches in England in the time of Edward VI., not only thought the office lawful, but considered it of Divine authority, and according to the Order of Church Discipline which he drew up, they were to be admitted to office by the laying on of hands. John Wynram, Superintendent of Fife after the

Reformation, is described on his tombstone as "Episcopus Fiforum." Erskine of Dun, another of our superintendents, says that superintendent and bishop are the same, and he quotes the cases of Timothy and Titus as scriptural authority for the office. The idea that our Reformed Church meant the office of superintendent to be temporary is one of those popular errors which it is hard to kill, but it rests on no sufficient ground. The Assembly, year after year, until the setting up of titular Episcopacy, petitioned the Government to appoint superintendents in all parts of the kingdom. John Knox preferred the superintendent system to the Episcopal, properly so-called, but he did not object to the latter. When offered a bishopric in England in the time of Edward VI. he declined the offer, not on grounds of principle, but partly because of the troubles which he anticipated on the accession of Mary, and partly because he thought that the English dioceses were too large, and ought to be subdivided.

If bishops had accepted the Reformation with their clergy and their flocks, Calvin would have been quite content that they should continue to hold their posts. Writing to the King of Poland in 1554, he says: "If one Archbishop should now preside over the Kingdom of Poland, not indeed to domineer over the rest nor to arrogate to himself their authority, but for the sake of order to preside over their Synods, and to maintain a righteous union among his colleagues and brethren, there might then be provincial bishops to preserve order. For nature herself dictates that in every Society one should be chosen to direct affairs."

IV. Let us turn now to the Church of England, which alone of the Reformed Churches claims to have retained what is nowadays called the historic episcopate.

In the beginning of the Reformation the Church of England was of opinion that there were only two orders, those of bishop or presbyter and deacon, of divine right. This was not left an open question, but was authoritatively decided.

In 1537 the book called *The Institution of a Christian Man* received the sanction of Convocation. In treating of what it calls the Sacrament of Orders, it says: "This office, this power of ministry, was given and conferred by Christ and His Apostles unto certain persons only—that it is to say, unto priests or bishops, whom they did elect, call, and admit thereto by their prayers and imposition of hands. . . . In the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinction in orders, but only of deacons or ministers, and of priests or bishops." The same thing is repeated, with some slight changes, in *The King's Book* of 1540: "Of these two orders only, priests and deacons, Scripture maketh express mention, and how they were conferred of the Apostles by prayer and the imposition of their hands, and to these two the primitive Church did add and conjoin certain other and lower degrees, as of sub-deacons, etc."

After the accession of Edward VI. the House of Lords in January, 1550, approved beforehand a new ordinal to be drawn up by six bishops and six divines, to be appointed by the King, which ordinal was to be set forth under the Great Seal before the

1st of April following. Cranmer had the chief hand in it, and it was made obligatory, without having been submitted to Convocation. The preface states that—"It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Scriptures and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons." In the ordinal itself the distinction of the order of bishop from that of priest is not definitely asserted, and the Pope pronounced it invalid, and ordered the clergy who had been ordained under it in Edward's reign, and who were willing to submit to his authority under Mary, to be re-ordained. After the Restoration the ordinal was felt to be so unsatisfactory by the Church of England itself, that it was amended in its present form, but this was a hundred years too late.

Looking to Cranmer's general views, to the close alliance of the Edwardian Reformers with the leaders of the Reformed Churches on the Continent, and to the fact that at that time no one in the English Church questioned the validity of Presbyterian ordination, the statement quoted from the preface to the ordinal can hardly have meant more than this, that ever since the days of the Apostles there had been imparity among presbyters.

During the reigns of Edward, of Elizabeth, and of James, a large number of clergymen from the Continent and from Scotland in Presbyterian orders, held livings in England, and in 1570 Parliament enacted that such ministers should, on admission to benefices, be required to declare their assent to the articles of religion. The words of the Act, which was understood to include ministers both in Romish

and Presbyterian orders, are as follows: "Every person under the degree of a bishop that shall pretend to be a priest or minister of God's Word and Sacraments by reason of any other form of institution, consecration or ordering than the form set forth by Parliament in the time of King Edward, or now used in the reign of our Sovereign Lady, shall in the presence of the bishop or guardian of the spiritualities of some one diocese, where he hath, or shall have, ecclesiastical living, declare his assent, and subscribe to all the articles of religion which only concern the confession of the true Christian Faith and the doctrine of the Sacraments, . . . and shall bring from such bishop or guardian a testimonial of such assent and subscription, and openly on some Sunday in the time of the public service afore noon in every church where, by reason of any ecclesiastical living, he ought to attend, read both the said testimonials, and the said articles, upon pain that every such person which shall not . . . do so, as is above appointed, shall be deprived." There is extant a letter on the subject of Episcopal authority of date November 4th, 1588, from Dr. Hammond to Lord Burleigh, Elizabeth's great Minister. It is evident that he had asked Dr. Hammond to state the grounds on which superiority of bishops rested in England. In reply, Dr. Hammond argues at length that the superiority of bishops over presbyters has no foundation in Scripture, and then maintains that it is lawful for the Sovereign to commit to a minister of the Word and Sacraments superiority over many Churches and pastors. His letter concludes thus: "The bishops of our realm do not, so

far as I ever yet heard, nor may claim to themselves, any other authority than is given them by the statute of the 25th of King Henry the VIII., created in the first year of her Majesty's reign, or by other statutes of the law, neither is it reasonable they should make any other claim, for if it had pleased her Majesty with the wisdom of the realm to have used no bishops at all, we could not have complained justly of any defect in our Church, or if it had liked them to limit the authority of bishops to shorter terms they might not have said they had any wrong. But since it hath pleased her Majesty to use the ministry of bishops, and to assign them their authority, it must be to me that am a subject as God's ordinance, and therefore to be obeyed according to S. Paul's rule."

This was more than fifty years after the beginning of the Reformation in England. Archbishop Whitgift must have been familiar with this document, and must have agreed with it, for we find him writing thus: "If it had pleased her Majesty with the wisdom of the Realm to have used no bishops at all, we could not have complained of any defect in our Church."

By common consent Bancroft, afterward Archbishop of Canterbury, was the first to take high ground for the Episcopate in a sermon preached in January, 1588-9. His contention, I believe, was not that the Episcopate is a distinct order by Divine right, but that it is of Divine right that some presbyters should be placed in authority over others. There is a wide difference between these two positions, but whatever Bancroft's exact opinion, his

sermon raised a great storm of opposition, notwithstanding that he himself admitted the validity of Presbyterian orders.

In 1578 the orders of Whittingham, Dean of Durham, were questioned. He had been admitted to the ministry in the English congregation at Geneva, and there was some doubt as to his having received the laying on of hands. His death occurred before the trial was finished, but if he had been deprived it would not have been because he received ordination from presbyters having public authority in the Reformed Church of Geneva, but because he had not. Four years later, in 1582, Archbishop Grindal acknowledged the orders of John Morison, who had been minister of Bara, in East Lothian, in the following terms:—"Since he was admitted and ordained to sacred orders and the holy ministry by the imposition of hands according to the laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland, the Archbishop ratifies and approves the form of his ordination, and licenses him to celebrate divine offices and minister the sacraments throughout the whole province of Canterbury."

We learn from Calderwood and from Travers that other Scots ministers held livings in England at that time. Travers' words are that "in consequence of the Act of Elizabeth, there were at that time (1586) many Scots Divines in possession of benefices in the Church of England." Archbishop Whitgift refused to acknowledge Travers' orders, not because they were presbyterian, but because "he, holding the authorities of his own Church in utter

contempt, repudiating their discipline and despising their orders, had gone abroad on purpose to free himself from their authority, and to receive his commission there from the hands of a mere set of malcontents like himself." Travers never received Episcopal ordination, but was made Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, by Archbishop Loftus. In the 55th Canon of the Church of England, drawn up in 1603 after James had succeeded Elizabeth, it is ordered that "before all sermons, lectures, and homilies, the preachers and ministers shall move the people to join with them in prayer in this form. . . . Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, . . . and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland." As our Church was then Presbyterian, this Canon has of late been a crux to Anglicans, but they attempt to get over it by asserting that "at the time when the Canon was passed Scotland had accepted Episcopal government. Its bishops were not then consecrated, and were not consecrated till 1610. But there was every reason to believe that a re-union would be carried out on the basis of Episcopacy." Such assertions give a very erroneous impression. It is true that in 1600 the General Assembly acceded to the request of the King, that there should be representatives of the Church in Parliament, but they were to be called commissioners, not bishops, and every precaution was taken to prevent this change paving the way for the introduction of Episcopacy. The Scottish clergy, says Dr. Cook, at this time "displayed the utmost aversion to any essential distinction amongst ministers, and though they conceded the vote in

Parliament, they preserved the fundamental maxims of that Presbyterian polity to which they had ever been warmly attached." Before leaving Scotland in 1603, James gave the most solemn assurances that he would not change the government of the Scottish Church, or introduce any further innovations. It is not to the honour of the Anglican divines of 1603 to say that they passed Canon 55 because they believed that the King intended to break his promise.

James succeeded in inducing the Church of Scotland to accept a modified form of Episcopacy in 1610, and without any authority from the Assembly summoned the newly-appointed bishops to England to receive Episcopal consecration. Spottiswood, one of the number, says: "A question was moved by Dr. Andrews, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scots bishops who, as he said, must first be ordained presbyters, as having received no ordination from a bishop. The Archbishop of Canterbury (*viz.*, Bancroft), who was by, maintained that thereof there was no necessity, seeing when bishops could not be had the ordination given by Presbyters must be esteemed lawful, otherwise that it might be doubted if there was any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches. Thus applauded by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced."

There is another account which implies that the difficulty was got over because precedents justified the ordination of a bishop at once from being a layman, but this version rests only on the authority of Heylin, who was but ten years old at the time, and is not to be put in competition with that of Spottis-

wood, who was present, and deeply interested in the matter.

Bishop Morton of Durham, a friend of Hooker, states, in 1620, that no duly ordained foreign pastor had at that time ever been re-ordained in England, and in 1650 Bishop Cosin of Durham, a High Churchman, writes as follows: "If at any time a minister ordained in the French Churches came to incorporate himself in ours, as I have known some of them to have so done of late, and can instance in many others before my time, our bishops did not re-ordain him before they admitted him to his charge. . . . Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received among us, and to subscribe the articles established."

Even the Act of Uniformity passed at the Restoration has a clause which leaves the door open for the admission to benefices without re-ordination of Foreign Reformed ministers. Shortly after it became law, a French Protestant who was ordained by Presbyters in France was admitted to a Rectory in Kent without re-ordination, in succession to a minister who had been deprived because he had been ordained by Presbyters in England during the Rebellion. Philip Henry, father of the commentator, writes in his Diary, under the year 1672: "Suppose a Dutch or French Protestant minister to come into England to preach, he is not re-ordained, but only licensed;" and so late as 1820 many of the Parochial clergy in the Channel Islands, which form part of the Diocese of Winchester, had only Presbyterian ordination. A generation ago many of the missionaries sent out by the Propagation Society, which is

presided over by the whole bench of bishops, were foreigners in Presbyterian orders.

V. In Scotland, as already mentioned, the Confession of Faith which was in force during the reign of Episcopacy, declared that Apostolic succession through bishops was not a mark of the Church. Between 1610 and 1638, re-ordination was not dreamt of either in the case of the ordinary clergy or of ministers promoted to bishoprics. Some of the bishops consecrated in England at the Restoration were obliged to submit to re-ordination, but they did not believe in it, and did not practise it on their return to Scotland. Dr. Grub mentions a case of re-ordination before the Revolution by Bishop Mitchell of Aberdeen, but he informed me that it was the only case he had met with, and he presumed that it had been done privately. Till 1688 the Scots bishops used the unamended English ordinal. At the Revolution the large body of Episcopal clergy who were willing to acknowledge King William as their Sovereign, offered to accept the Presbyterian government of the Church, and the small Jacobite section which originated the present Scottish Episcopal Church, had among its first clergy several who had only Presbyterian orders.

For some of the foregoing statements I am indebted to a volume by Martin Rule, M.A., entitled, *Apostolic Succession, not a Doctrine of the Church of England*, and I think it of very great importance, in the interests both of historic truth and Christian unity, that they should be widely known.

The most learned Anglican writers are now admitting that Episcopacy was gradually introduced,

and was not universal in the Primitive Church, and some of them are prepared not only to recognise Presbyterian orders, but the Congregationalist ministry derived from the people. Here we must part company with them. Because the argument for the Divine right of Episcopacy breaks down, it by no means follows that ordination by Presbyters, and Apostolic succession through them, are not essential to a valid ministry.

Ordination : Recent Doctrine and Practice.

VERY REV. THOMAS LEISHMAN, D.D.

I AM not aware that among Presbyterians any new doctrine as to ordination has been *formally* promulgated in our own generation or in those immediately preceding it. But it can hardly be denied that current opinion to a considerable and an increasing extent has been missing its significance, or at least undervaluing its importance. The question was keenly discussed in the seventeenth century when our fathers were laying down the landmarks which defined their position relatively to other religious bodies at home and abroad. On this particular point they differed on the one side from Episcopalians, on the other from Independents; but the difference with the latter was wider than with the former. They were at one with Episcopalians in regarding ordination as a rite whereby the ministerial office is conferred in the name of Christ by men who have themselves been already invested with it. They differed from them as to the ministrants, one or many, to whom is assigned the duty of transmitting the sacred commission. Yet they did not differ with them so far as to challenge the

validity of ordination conferred by a bishop, himself a presbyter, and having other presbyters associated with him in the act.

But with the Independents they differed both as to the source and the channel by which a right to minister in word, sacraments and discipline was conveyed. They held that it had its origin in the commission given by the incarnate Redeemer to the first ministers of His Church, and continued from age to age by transmission through those who had already received it. Their ideal was visible Catholicity, both national, to be preserved where it existed, and ecumenical, whenever it could be recovered, shattered as it had been for many hundreds of years before the Reformation. The Independent, on the other hand, made little, if anything, of the visibility of the Catholic Church. In his view the ecclesiastical unit is a body of professed, and, as far as can be ascertained, of real Christians, accustomed to assemble in one place. From them the ministerial commission has its origin. By them it can at pleasure be recalled. Those who hold it can claim of right no authority over neighbouring units, and by parity of reasoning, need submit to none. For all office emanates in its completeness from the congregational suffrage, and its limitations are defined by the bounds of the body which created it.

Close relations may exist between these detached organisations. There may be a federated alliance for financial or educational, or polemical ends. But at any moment any such union could be dissolved, or single churches detach themselves from it, without their fundamental principle of existence being touched.

Temporary or accidental expedients of this kind apart, each congregation is a Church or sect complete in itself. Some ceremonial recognition of the officials is a natural accompaniment of their selection, and the name *ordination* may be given to it in imitation of other religious bodies, though in a sense essentially different from theirs. We can, indeed, suppose it applied to the initiation of those who take up under limitations any secular employment. Lately I saw in a newspaper an advertisement by some one describing himself as an ordained surveyor, indicating no doubt the existence of some association in connection with that industry.

But ordination in the Presbyterian sense differs from such inaugurations as those of which I have been speaking, differs as regards its primary source, the persons by whom it is conferred, and the range of the authority which it conveys. We hold that congregational suffrage is not the spring from which the ministerial function flows, while admitting that in various forms and degrees it may be allowed to influence the selection of the individual on whom the sacred office is to be conferred. With us actual instalment in the ministry comes from officials external to the congregation, who validate the candidate's admission by a ceremony in which the vacant congregation has no part. Thereby they confer in the name of the Lord Jesus, the Head of the Universal Church, the same office with which they themselves have been invested in the same great Name, including among its functions that of ruling other congregations, possibly far remote. Consecration of ministers thus conditioned, with the

Scriptural ordinance of the laying on of hands as its visible sign, is what we call their ordination. In the Form of Church Government, accepted by our fathers along with the other Westminster standards, it is declared that "no man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the word without a lawful calling," that "ordination is always to be continued in the Church," and that "every minister of the word is to be ordained by imposition of hands and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong."¹ From that time to this the *usage* has been continued in Scotland without challenge of the *doctrine*, and the more easily that till recent days Independency as a formulated system was practically unknown in this country.

But notwithstanding our profession a tincture of Independency has entered into the system of the Reformed Scottish Church. Traces of it were discernible even before the Westminster era. Prolonged contact then with some who held it, the opportunities which our Cromwellian conquerors found of indoctrinating the extreme Presbyterians with it, and in the next generation the proneness of a party sorely tried by Prelatists to take up opinions as remote as possible from those of their hated opponents, all helped to sow and to quicken the seed. At the same time we must not forget the steadfast testimony maintained against it and kindred backslidings, under the generic name of sectarianism, by the more consistent of the Presbyterians.

¹ *Form of Church Government*, "Touching the Doctrine of Ordination."

Since those days the history of the Scottish Church has been largely the record of Congregationalist principles seeking to make their way to the surface. There has been a tendency advancing step by step to magnify the part appertaining to the congregation in forming the pastoral tie. Not only was the system of lay patronage abolished, but at the point which the movement has now reached, the Presbytery, which in old times regulated at every stage the whole process of selection, are now at an early moment set aside till they are wanted for the ordination ceremony. The session, as such, is silenced at the same time, and its individual members are frequently excluded from that unpresbyterian body, the electoral Committee, which has displaced them. The landowners also, who once shared the right of election with the session (which two bodies, and not as many fancy, the people, were those who were deprived of power by Queen Anne's patronage act), have no voice, notwithstanding their permanent interest in the parish. To fulfil by delegation the functions of these bodies an electoral roll is drawn up, embracing classes whose admission would have been scouted by the Presbyterian ancestors whose names are continually invoked in this connection—communicants not heads of families, minors, females, non-communicants, non-parishioners. In all this there is an unconscious development of the principle that the ministerial office is generated by the congregation, not transmitted through the Church. Amid the very secular excitement awakened by the use of the suffrage, what place is there for thoughts of the heavenly grace which St. Paul described as

“ the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands ” ?

Another phase of the same movement is discernible in the fatal facility with which new sects spring from the hotbed of controversy. Scottish schism from the eighteenth century onward has usually had its origin, avowedly or virtually, in the opinion that the source of ministry is in the detached congregation, and that when it meets with any obstruction it has a divine right to evolve from itself a new sect, federated with others or not, as circumstances allow. Akin to this are the claims occasionally heard of as coming from ruling elders to take part in the act of ordination ; that is to confer powers, such as the right to administer sacraments, which they do not themselves possess, either to use or to give. All these opinions, whether embodied in dissent or in a state of flotation in the minds of those who have not revolted from the national centre of unity, evince an indifference to the true *doctrine* of ordination, even where the *practice* is continued. Can we wonder that Independency, notwithstanding the division among its adherents as to the baptism of infants, should be increasing rapidly far in excess of any corresponding growth of our aggregate Presbyterianism, or that there should be so ready a lapse into Congregationalism of Scottish Church people settling in England ? All is the natural outcome of the feeling that the minister is not an ambassador of Christ in virtue of his ordination, but an employé of the congregation which selects and subsidises him.

Attempts to rest ordination on the old Presby-

terian basis are met by an assertion that this is to fraternise with Rome. The argument, if valid, needs only to be pressed by a Socinian to make us abandon belief in the Holy Trinity or the Atonement, or by an Antipædobaptist to make us cease the administration of Baptism to infants. The truth, however, is that on this point of order the Pope is more at one with the Independent minister than with the Presbyterian. For his Holiness's authority, autocratic, infallible, all-absorbing as it claims to be, emanates, like that of his humbler brother, from a body of electors who as individuals are possessed of no such authority in themselves. On the question of a standing ministry, our opinions have more in common with the Reformed Episcopate than with Romanism on the one hand, or with Brownism or individualism on the other; though there remains the sharp difference between Prelate and Presbytery as the primary instrument in ordination, a difference, however, which is less as seen from our side than from the other.

Of late there has been much speculation as to the possibilities of unity among the numerous bodies of Christians which divide our land. These discussions have revealed the fact that those who are hopeful have two different results in view. What some have in contemplation is a kindly sympathy between denominations. In conjunction with this, they have a reserved opinion that since disunion has its advantages, it is premature to think of bringing it to an end; if, however, our Father contemplates this consummation He will bring it to pass in His own time and way. Others, believing that schism is in

its own nature an evil thing, think it their immediate duty to testify against it as fellow-workers with Him, and to seek after that actual unity which is made visible by being sacramentally sealed. Among those in Scotland who think so, the first and easiest aim ought to be the re-union of Presbyterians, not to form a larger sect, but to be the exponents of that national Catholicity in which our fathers believed. If that were attained, or if its attainment were found to be hopeless, there would emerge the question of corporate union with those here as elsewhere who hold the Catholic faith, as embodied in some such symbol as that popularly styled the Nicæan, the creed at once of widest acceptance and most assured origin. As to the organisation by which this ought to be sustained, our irreducible minimum must be ordination by presbyters, since congregational ordination, under whatever disguise, makes each Christian assemblage a complete sect, bound by no essential nexus to the rest of Christendom. Circumstances might require, as a matter of expediency, such a concentration of presbyterial power as was the superintendency of old Scotland and of many branches of the Continental Reformed. But even then, the position that the presbyterate is the fundamental order ought never to be surrendered.

The Pentecostal Gift in relation to Rule, Obedience, and Concord in the Church.

REV. H. MONCRIEFF MACGILL.

THE subject of Rule, Obedience, and Concord in the Church, their high sanction and heavenly source, is one at all times and everywhere worthy of thoughtful regard, and its bearing upon the condition of things amongst ourselves increases for us its great practical importance. We Scots do not readily submit ourselves in ecclesiastical matters to the rule of the most approved authority. We are famous neither for rule nor for obedience; while concord in Scotland is only conspicuous by reason of its absence. The often-heard words that form part of the fine hymn, "Onward, Christian Soldiers,"

"We are not divided,
All one body we,
One in hope and doctrine,
One in charity,"

appear, when heard in Scotland, the very opposite of the truth; they are probably not true as regards any one congregation, and they are certainly false as

regards the larger Christian community. Our only consolation in the present state of matters must be that it is not of our creation, but has been received by us in sad inheritance. Our fathers have eaten sour grapes (not without apparent enjoyment), and if our teeth are set on edge, to that we owe it. Deploring the condition of things in which we find ourselves, let us be careful that we do nothing to increase the confusion that exists, and let us humble ourselves before God in confession and penitence, and pray that the Church may entrust herself to that guidance which the Holy Spirit always gives to the humble and obedient.

Under that Divine guidance the Church of God at the first was organised and ordered. God is the author of peace and not of confusion, and His Church is no mere heap of stones, but a beautiful and stately building, in which God, through the Spirit, dwells. It is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner-stone; in Whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord."¹ Each stone, itself holy, may in a sense be itself a temple in which the Holy Spirit dwells; but the Church is that in which all the living stones (each several building) are builded together for an habitation of God in the Spirit. Each has its own individual life, but all together have a life common and corporate—in which each acts and reacts upon the life of the others.

To this latter, the corporate life of the Church (one body though of many members), belongs Rule,

¹ Ephes. ii. 20 (R.V.).

with its correlate Obedience, and its consequence Concord. In every human association, every form of organised society, there must be the ruler and the ruled, those who bear authority to govern and those who are bound to obey. The type and form of government may vary, but it remains an essential feature of organised society that some within the limits of their commission and office have authority, and are to be obeyed. The weight of the authority exercised, in its claim upon the obedience of the ruled, must in each case depend upon its source. In the case under consideration, we must own the claim to be great indeed. All government is, in a sense, of God; the powers that be are ordained of God—the civil magistrate in his own sphere is God's minister, to whom we are bound to subject ourselves, not only from fear, but for conscience' sake. But the government of the Church is of God in a far higher sense, in a supremely high sense. Its apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers were the gift of our ascended Lord by the Holy Ghost. The Church's offices and ministries are from Him and of Him. The men to fill them may (save at the first) have been humanly chosen, and yet behind that choice and beneath it was the Holy Spirit, inspiring, directing, and qualifying. S. Paul addresses the elders of the Church at Ephesus, saying, "Take heed to all the flock in which"—not I, not man, but—"the Holy Ghost had made you overseers, to feed the Church of God which He purchased with His own blood."

These ministries were the gift of Christ bestowed through Him by Whom Christ works. He ascended

on high ; He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men ; and these gifts were the ministries of the Church—for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ, till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. In the ordinary course of life in Christ it is through the instrumentality of these divine gifts that the saint is perfected, that the body of Christ is edified, and that men rise from spiritual immaturity to that perfect stature. However imperfectly the ideal of such ministry has been realised on earth, we may not doubt that these ministries ordained by Him are by Him perpetuated, and are the channels through which most generally, most easily, and most abundantly His grace is poured out for men ; as also that they who are set in those ministries both teach and rule with an authority which is not of man, but of God.

“ We have this treasure in earthen vessels.” It is not always easy at the present day to recognise the voice of the Spirit in the sermons heard from our pulpits. The teaching thence given is too often a morality, beautiful and to be desired because drawn from a divine source, but floating in the air like a windy vapour of mist, because detached and drawn away from the river of living water, cut off from that which can alone give weight and momentum to our teaching, the faith of God Manifest, God with us, of the supernatural (the absolutely miraculous and directly divine) in our holy religion.

However this may be, men can speak with autho-

only as conscious of divine commission and as having maintained in faithful life and prayer the grace received in their ordination. As thus conscious and thus faithful they stand where God has set them to feed the flock of God, not with the husks of mere human speculation, but with these great truths on which from apostolic times the souls of the faithful have been nourished. They are then able to speak, exhort, rebuke with all authority, not as lording it over the charge committed to them, but as declaring the counsel of God and as making themselves ensamples to the flock. They stand where they do to receive, to preserve, to show forth, and to transmit the sacred deposit of fact and truth which was once committed to the Church by our Lord and His Apostles, and both to speak authoritatively and to govern firmly in the spirit of power and love and discipline.

If there be this authority to teach and rule, the corresponding obligation to receive and obey follows of necessity. The exhortation of the Scripture is to know them that labour among us, and are over us in the Lord and admonish us, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake;¹ again, to remember them that had the rule over us (now passed away by death), which spake unto us the word of God;² and again, to obey them that have the rule over us, seeing they watch on behalf of our souls as those that must give account.³ In such words the Apostles (it is impossible to doubt) claimed obedience from the flock both for themselves and for

¹ 1 Thess. v. 12 (R.V.).

² Heb. xiii. 7 (R.V.).

³ Heb. xiii. 17 (R.V.).

those also whom they ordained in the various scattered churches ; and that not merely because of the personal fitness and faithfulness of such persons from a human point of view, but because of their divine commission.

It is admitted that the ideal which could manifestly justify this claim of obedience has never been perfectly realised. No divine ideal ever is. Neither as a doctrine nor as a life has Christianity been ever fully realised. Individuals here and there have attained high, but the average of attainment has never been high :

“And none, O Lord, have perfect rest,
For none are wholly free from sin ;
And they that fain would serve Thee best
Are conscious most of wrong within.”

Humility, for example, is not a plant that grows easily or profusely in the soil of human nature. It is not indigenous. It is not easily cultivated, and it is very easily killed. The more, therefore, is it to be regretted that those set apart to instruct and govern in the church should be encouraged to self-display instead of self-effacement, and should so tend to become mere lecturers from a human standpoint, teaching (as the children say) “out of their own head,” instead of preachers of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, teaching out of “the Apostles’ doctrine.”

The result of Authority on the one side, Obedience on the other, and humility in all, would be Concord. This once attained, the idea of the Church as united not alone by the invisible spiritual tie which unites the individual soul to Christ, but in visible corporate union, would be better understood, and its

realisation more desired. Men would pray for it more fervently and faithfully ; would seek with pains to realise it as a matter of supreme moment ; and to attain it would feel disposed to sacrifice almost anything short of the essentials of the faith.

The Pentecostal Gift in relation to Rule, Obedience, and Concord in the Church.

REV. JAMES LANDRETH, M.A.

THE most definite as well as most comprehensive exposition of the relation of the Holy Ghost to the varied activities of the Church is probably that contained in the twelfth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. There we find a distinct recognition of the necessary diversity of gifts, ministrations, and methods, all pervaded and unified by the one Divine Spirit. As coming from S. Paul, this chapter is specially significant. Definition and argument were easy to him, and his early training might have been supposed to predispose him towards great precision, if not detail, in the treatment of ecclesiastical government and the functions and relations of rulers in the Church. He could well have outlined, had he wished, a polity which would have placed beyond reach of dispute many matters still debated.

Further, as an Apostle and Father in God, he was perhaps the greatest administrator that the Church has ever had, uniting with glorious intellectual gifts a sympathy and tact in dealing with the infant Christian communities which are wholly unparalleled.

Yet in great measure he left the task of ecclesiastical legislation to others. He could not willingly look at the Church from the outside. He felt himself thrilled and uplifted by the wonderful life of the Spirit that was flowing through the Church in ceaseless waves of light and love. He was speaking of the universal Christian consciousness when he said elsewhere, "I live, yet nevertheless not I." And after referring in the close of the chapter (1 Cor. xii.) to the disputes possible about gifts and functions, he summarily doffs the rôle of the ecclesiastical ruler, and breaks out into that noble ode to Charity, in which as poet and as prophet he is seen to be the greatest in faculty and vision of all whom Christ appointed to bear witness of Him.

To S. Paul, the Church was less an institution than a living organism—God's greater Creation—a spiritual body vitalised in even its humblest parts by the Holy Ghost. He loves to speak of the Church as a household—a family—a fabric of living stones. The idea is that of the most tender, intimate, yet most indissoluble of all associations. The life as well as the teaching of the Apostolic Church was full of the family spirit. The family was in one aspect the ideal. In theory and in practice, all the members of the Church were brethren in Christ through the operation of the One Spirit. In the great Apostle's own attitude to the different branches of the Church we see authority without assumption, control without severity, a constant determination to persuade rather than command, and by every means to "endeavour to keep the

unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." So had he learned Christ. This was his ground-principle of the working of the Holy Catholic Church. From his knowledge of his divine Master through the teaching of the Spirit, he gathered that the true attitude of those in spiritual authority was not the continuous command "Go," but Christ's invitation "Come."

Rule, Obedience, and Concord in the Church must be viewed in the light of these premises. They are Pentecostal Gifts—most precious and heavenly—and can only be rightly used on that supposition. The government of the Church of God must be regarded as a function entrusted to certain men for the perfecting of the saints. There may be, and there are, differences among Christian people as to methods of government, but there need be no dispute that the body most completely organised affords the fullest possibility of an expression of the mind of the Holy Spirit. Simplicity of organisation may only be another name for inadequacy. S. Paul, in this connection, selects as his illustration the most complex organism in the known universe—the human body, with all its infinite aptitudes. And it is clear, though he does not dwell on the point, that the Church of God, as he viewed it, had a multiplicity of function, calling for great variety of special human faculties, through which the Spirit might operate.

Such a conception presents weighty and pressing issues for our consideration. Are we satisfied, for example, that the function of Rule is properly apprehended at present in the Scottish Church?

Take the instance of ecclesiastical courts, where all members are rulers. Take the case of a tribunal consisting of six hundred judges. Take the case of clergy and congregations who are responsible only to a greater or smaller corporation which is virtually an abstraction, and in which every person may say quite legally, though not heroically, "Am I my brother's keeper?" In what department of secular life in which the principle of Rule is sought to be realised, do we find such a distribution of authority as virtually amounts to its annihilation? The Church is nothing if not active. It is in the field and in presence of the enemy; and yet it is organised in Scotland on methods strictly analogous to an army in which all are commanders. What is good in the so-called prelatic principle—viz. the concentration of ruling power in the hands of individual men qualified to govern—is invariably acted upon in every institution except the Church. Can it be said that the Pentecostal Gift of Rule is receiving right recognition and development when, in mere submission to inherited ideas, the ordinary precautions taken, in any human enterprise, to secure good government, are rejected as an invasion of spiritual freedom?

It has been abundantly shown (*e.g.* by Dr. Sprott) that the revival of the office of the Superintendent is in strict harmony with Presbyterian principles. The revival of such an office in happier times than those immediately succeeding the events of 1560 would, however, be attended by a different conception than then prevailed of its leading aims and its prevailing spirit. It would be, it might be hoped, an Apostolic

Rule, in which love would be as prominent as wisdom. It would call for the exercise of the very noblest gifts. It would require from those who held it some faculties more exalted than those of mere debating skill or ecclesiastical astuteness. For it is such an office as demands men of large hearts and generous sympathies, filled with the gracious Spirit of Him who would not break the bruised reed, or quench the smoking flax: men who, far indeed behind their Lord, yet, in their own degree, would be to the clergy and people committed to their charge as "an hiding-place from the tempest, and as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land."

The exercise of the Pentecostal Gift of Obedience, on the other hand, largely depends on the nature of the authority to which it is asked to respond. Spiritual government never demands the surrender of what is inalienable in individual freedom. For "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." But, on the other hand, if Rule is rightly embodied, if it is exercised by capable and worthy men, according to Law and not as chance majorities may determine, if power is reposed in noble persons, then Obedience will be cheerfully rendered even by minds of an independent cast.

It has often been said that our own nation is peculiarly impatient of control, and especially in matters of religion. It has been so only when authority was either divided, or placed in unsuitable hands. The attachment of Scotsmen to great principles is even surpassed by their passionate and chivalrous devotion to great men. In the case of the Church, the measure in which the rulers are

unconscious of themselves, and are animated with a sense of the grandeur and responsibility of their divine commission, will determine the measure in which the appeal to the spirit of Obedience will receive ready and loyal response.

The Pentecostal Gift—Hindrances to the Present Operation of the Holy Spirit in the Church : a Call to Revived Faith, Penitence, and Prayer.

REV. PROFESSOR COOPER, D.D.

AMONG the Hindrances to the present powerful operation of the Holy Ghost in the Church must be reckoned, I fear, first of all, and chief of all, and most dishonouring alike to Him the Divine Indweller, and to the Church that suffers it, and suffers from it—*Unbelief in the Holy Ghost.*

Alas! it cannot be denied that there is much unbelief among us—unrebuked unbelief—in regard to the Holy Ghost.

The cases, one may hope, are few, where His Personality and Deity are formally denied. More frequently He is consistently ignored. How seldom is He so much as mentioned in the modern sermon! How often when “the Spirit of Christ” is spoken of, does it turn out that what the preacher means is only the mind of Christ, His disposition and temper, and not at all that “other Comforter”¹ Whom He pro-

¹S. John xiv. 16.

mised to His Apostles, and, on the Day of Pentecost, poured forth upon the Church.

One would not like to say that these preachers had "not so much as heard that there is a Holy Ghost," or "that the Holy Ghost was given";¹ but certainly one would not gather it from their discourses.

And, although we assert His Person and Divinity, it is unbelief also in the Holy Ghost to deny, or ignore, His works—those works which in the greatest of the Creeds, when we have confessed Himself, we go on with grateful triumph to enumerate—the *Prophets*, by whom He spake, the *One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church* of whom He is the Life, the *One Baptism for the remission of sins*, the *Resurrection of the dead*, and *the life of the world to come*.²

Again with regard to Scripture. In former days we dwelt perhaps too exclusively on the Divine Inspirer of Holy Scripture; and recognised too faintly the gracious fact that He vouchsafed, in giving it, to accept of human instruments, and while He used them, to leave them not less but more (because more truly) human than He found them. Now it is all the other way. Many write and speak as taking for granted that there was no Intelligence behind the sacred writer, other, or greater, than that writer's own. S. Peter's express statement about the Prophets "searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ that was in them did signify when It testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ

¹ Acts xix. 2 (R.V. text and margin).

² Nicene Creed.

and the glory that should follow,"¹ is laid quietly upon the shelf as altogether out of date.

Then as to the Church. The presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, and His glorious working in her members was, to S. Paul, the sufficient evidence of the authority of the Christian dispensation, and its superiority to Judaism. "This only would I learn of you," he says, "received you the Spirit by the works of the Law or by the hearing of Faith?"² Yet, as I remember, when the Scottish Church Society was founded, an official high in the service of our Church told Professor Milligan that he saw the root of every kind of evil in the first among the "Special Objects" which we bound ourselves to aim at: "The consistent affirmation of the Divine basis, and heavenly calling of the Church."³

And so, more recently, to defeat a well-devised scheme for Sunday School instruction, it was found sufficient in our General Assembly to raise the hackneyed cry, "What is this about Church, Church? let us get back to Christ." As if between Christ and His Church, the Head and the Body, there was any natural or necessary opposition; as if Christ had not given His Spirit to the Church, to fill her members with His life, to mould them into His likeness, to make them all, by that which every joint supplieth, the organised instrument for the doing of His work

¹ 1 S. Peter i. 11.

² Galat. iii. 2.

³ What conception can that gentleman have of the Church of Scotland? Does he think the Church is the mere creation of an Act of Parliament? It would not, in that case, be a Church at all, but only the vain and deluding *simulacrum* of a Church.

on earth, and the making "known unto the principalities and powers in the heavenly places the manifold wisdom of God."¹

What, again, is the underlying notion in that other cry which so frequently assails us, the accusation—to adopt its own uninformed phraseology—of "Sacramentarianism"? Would men assail the Sacraments, or assail us for making of them neither more nor less—certainly not more—than the Bible and our Standards make of them, if they really believed that the Holy Ghost works in and through the Sacraments? That Christian Baptism is not of water only, but of "water and the Spirit";² that in the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood it "is the Spirit that quickeneth"?³

Or what, again, is the meaning of the cry, a far nobler cry, I will admit, and one with which we in this Society have far greater sympathy—the cry which we sometimes hear as to the Church's need of a new outpouring of the Holy Ghost? Do these good people believe that the Holy Ghost is come? that He is here, abiding in the Church? as ready as ever to make the standing ordinances (the ordinances of Christ's own appointing) the means of our reviving, if only we will use them in humble and obedient faith? Must we take these men again to Horeb, and read to them the lesson taught there to the despairing prophet: The Lord is not in the wind, not in the earthquake, not in the fire, but in

¹ Eph. iii. 10.

² S. John iii. 5. This text is quoted as referring to Baptism in the *Confession of Faith*, ch. xxviii.

³ S. John vi. 63.

that still small voice¹ which we may hear to-day if we will but listen?

Such, I believe, are the symptoms, such is the disease, from which the Church in Scotland is most of all suffering to-day. If it be so—if there be among us Unbelief in the Holy Ghost—in His true Personality and Deity, or (what in Christians is hardly less inexcusable) unbelief in the Holy Ghost as given in and abiding in the Church for ever, and in the honour which He puts upon her and His established ordinances—then, we need not wonder if His gracious operations are to a large extent hindered and checked amongst us. Of our Lord Himself, when He sojourned on earth, it is written that He could do no mighty works at Nazareth, save that He laid His hands on a few sick folk and healed them, and that He marvelled because of their unbelief.² How should it be different with the Spirit of Christ?

It is not different.

He is working among us still, no doubt, but, as it were, here and there; He visits individual souls. The full tide of His healing waters is restrained, and the Church is parched and dry for want of them, and she has no power to convince the world, because of her lack of faith in Him, or because "except she see signs and wonders she will not believe"³ that He is with her.

To this root of Unbelief (more or less developed) in the Holy Ghost must be traced certain other Hindrances which are its direct results: the entire or

¹ 1 Kings xix. 12.

² S. Matth. xiii. 58; compared with S. Mark vi. 5, 6.

³ S. John iv. 48.

partial *disuse* of certain appointed channels of His grace, and the using of such of them as we still employ *without due faith and honour*.

1. Take, first of all, that ordinance of Preaching, which we sometimes hear treated as if it were the only means of grace. The Preaching of the Word is an apt preparation for the Spirit. It was while S. Peter preached that the Holy Ghost fell on Cornelius and his household.¹ And if unbelief is our disease, Preaching is the special remedy for unbelief. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God."² Is, then, the Spirit of God preached among us as He ought to be? We are a perverse generation. If there is a festival in the Church's year which we know from Scripture was observed in Apostolic times, it is Pentecost, the yearly anniversary of the Coming of the Holy Ghost. S. Paul tells us, not once but twice, of his eagerness to be at Jerusalem on that day:—"I must by all means keep this feast that cometh at Jerusalem."³ Yet for twenty of our ministers who preach at Christmas on the Lord's Nativity, for ten who discourse on Easter Sunday of His Rising from the dead, will you find two who take the opportunity of Whitsunday to tell their people of the Coming of the Holy Ghost? When, on occasions, I have done so in some other church than my own, the theme has been received with wonder. Only once or twice in my nine-and-twenty

¹ Acts x. 44.

² Rom. x. 17.

³ Acts xviii. 21. It is not easy to suppose that when S. Paul kept this feast, he did so as a mere Jewish commemoration, and not as "unto the Lord" (Rom. xiv. 6), *i.e.* in honour of our Lord Jesus Christ.

years of ministry have the elders of a congregation come to me in a body to tender thanks for a sermon ; and once it was on the evening of Whitsunday, when I had preached on the account of the Spirit's coming in the Second Chapter of the Acts. " We never heard a sermon," they said, " on that before." How can people believe the doctrine if it be not preached to them ? if it be not systematically taught them, and sedulously inculcated ?

2. Then again in the Ministration of the Sacraments. The Sacrament of Baptism should be full of witness to the Blessed Spirit in Whom, as S. Paul teaches, " we are all baptised,"¹ Who is God's " Promise unto us and to our children."² Again, " If," says Dr. Sprott as to the Lord's Supper, in that treatise of the *Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland* which is the best *vade mecum* our ministers can use, (if) " the Holy Ghost, by whom the whole body of the Church is governed and sanctified, should be honoured in all acts of worship, this is peculiarly essential in the Holy Communion." The invocation of the Holy Ghost should be no less prominent in the Consecration Prayer than the Words of Institution themselves. And as we are to honour the Holy Spirit in the celebration of this Sacrament, so we are to recognise Him as the Power from on High through Whom it is made a Sacrament and means of grace. Our Blessed Lord comes to us, in the Sacred Feast, by the Spirit ; and He comes to refresh us with the Spirit ; as S. Paul bears witness : " We have all," he says, " been made to drink into one Spirit."³ Is it wonderful that we come short of

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 13.

² Acts ii. 39.

³ 1 Cor. xii. 13.

the Glory of God when we make such infrequent and formal use of this Ordinance of the Spirit? when we use the Table, which was meant as the standing ordinance of our spiritual nourishment and growth—not as something we can always approach to when we feel our need of it—but only at rare and stated intervals, as if it were rather an anniversary memorial of some one who is dead and gone, than a feast of loving intercourse with our Living Lord, and of our feeding upon Him and all His benefits?

I have no sympathy whatever with that error of the Romanists—their withholding the Cup, “the Cup of blessing,”¹ from all but the priest who celebrates. But I confess that I sometimes feel that it is a little hypocritical in us to condemn them for withholding *half* the Sacrament, when we ourselves, on forty-eight or fifty Sundays out of the fifty-two withhold the *whole* of it.

In regard to this function of the Lord’s Supper, as the ordinance of our “drinking into the Holy Ghost,” as well as to all the other functions of the great Gospel rite, I feel more and more as years go on the truth of that last, dying remark made to me by Dr. Milligan: “It seems to me,” he said, “that the greatest need of the Church of Scotland is the restoration of the weekly Eucharist.”²

3. Again, Ordination, like Baptism, is, in a fundamental degree, an ordinance of the Holy Ghost—“Over whom the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops!”³ Of course we retain the rite of ordination.

¹ 1 Cor. x. 16.

² See *Dictionary of National Biography*, Suppl., vol. iii., p. 175.

³ Acts xx. 28, R.V. (cf. Acts xiii. 2).

We could have no Ministry without it. But how little, in many cases, is made of it! We will not nowadays ask so much as a forenoon for it—any evening will do, perhaps a Sunday evening, with as few members of the presbytery as will suffice; and so it is too commonly fulfilled in circumstances such as make almost impossible that “solemn fasting” to which Scripture witnesses, and our own *Form of Church Government* prescribes to “be kept by the whole congregation, that they may more earnestly join in prayer for a blessing upon the ordinance of Christ and the labours of His servant for their good.”

4. Fasting itself is an ordinance of the Holy Ghost, which (by humbling our carnal pride and taming our carnal appetites) makes us more meet for His blessed workings in the soul. “If ye by the Spirit,” says S. Paul, “do mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live.”¹ The practice of Fasting was once common in our Church. The witness to it remains in our Standards as in the Bible;² but it has recently been described, I fear too truly, as one of the “lost habits of the religious life” in the Church of Scotland; and I can testify by some experience that there is nothing even in the Sermon on the Mount of which our people hear with more impatience.

5. I shall feel myself as one who “shunned to

¹ Rom. viii. 13.

² See S. Matth. vi. 16-18 (the writer was once severely taken to task for preaching on this text!); and *Confession of Faith*, xxi. 5, and the *Directory for Public Worship* ‘Concerning Public Solemn Fasting.’

declare the whole counsel of God,"¹ did I fail to mention one other ordinance—perhaps I should say two other ordinances—which the student of the New Testament finds there connected with the ministration of the Holy Ghost, but one of which we in the Church of Scotland no longer employ, while the other we can hardly be said to use *in its full Scriptural form*. The connection of the Spirit with that Unction (not of the dying, but) of *the sick*, which S. James prescribes, is not perhaps explicit, though I think it is implied in the mention of *oil*, which is ever in Scripture the emblem of the Holy Ghost.² But who can miss the reference to Him in the other rite which I refer to, *the laying on of the Apostles' hands*? Even Simon Magus "saw that by the laying on of the Apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given"³ to the converts at Samaria. Nor, apparently, was it Apostles only who were the instruments of His imparting. There was one in Galatia, nameless upon earth, who, in the midst of the great declension in the Churches there, is referred to by S. Paul as him "that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you."⁴ And the Writer to the Hebrews puts the doctrine of the laying on of hands side by side with the doctrine of baptisms among "the principles of the doctrine of Christ."⁵ What excuse have we for laying it aside? Not Scripture, not Catholic tradition, not "the example of the other Reformed Churches," for the Churches of Holland and Geneva have retained it. Not our Presbyterian system, for Presbyters

¹ Acts xx. 27.² S. James v. 15.³ Acts viii. 18.⁴ Galat. iii. 5.⁵ Heb. vi. 1.

confirmed in North Italy¹ in the fifth century, and to this day they confirm in the East; and if, as we believe, Presbyters ordain, how may they not also confirm? I venture to think that instead of complaining, as men sometimes do, of the Church of England, and the Scottish Episcopal Church, for attributing an excessive importance to Confirmation as ministered by their bishops, we might be better occupied in seeking to restore it to its due honour among ourselves.

But, even were we justified in our present attitude towards Confirmation, there is the too Unfrequent, and too frequently dishonouring, Employment of the other ordinances to which I have referred; there is, not seldom, the blaspheming of them as "forms," the deriding of any belief that God is pleased to work by means of them, as "Sacerdotalism."

How can men wonder that the operations of the Spirit are hindered in our land, if we first disuse, and then miscall the channels which our Lord ordained to be, like the golden pipes in the prophet's vision, the "ordinary means" of His Divine communications?

Our Shorter Catechism teaches us, in strict accordance with the Scriptures, that God requires of us, if we would be partakers of the Redemption purchased by Christ, three things: (1) Faith in Jesus Christ, (2) Repentance unto life, and (3) the diligent Use of all the outward and ordinary Means whereby

¹ See Bishop John Wordsworth's account of the Pseudo-Ambrosian treatise, *De Sacramentis*, and S. Ambrose's own *De Mysteriis*: "There is" (he says) "no reference to the Bishop as officiating in either book—though it is not said in the earlier book who administered the sealing." *The Ministry of Grace*, p. 81.

Christ communicateth to us the benefits of Redemption.¹

It is doubtful whether the first two can be really rendered without the third. Certainly, we should not have said of Naaman, for example, that he either really believed Elisha, or had repented of his pride, unless he had taken the further step and dipped himself seven times in Jordan.²

We must leave inventions of our own. We must resort in obedient faith to the Ordinances of Almighty God, if we would obtain that blessing which it is one good sign of us that we begin to see that we are needing. It is not enough that we should *pray* for the grace of the Spirit, if we will not *use these means*; and honour them, and Him Who hath appointed them. God will say to us as He said to Moses at the sea: "Wherefore criest thou unto Me? Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward";³ or as He said to Joshua before Ai: "Get thee up: wherefore liest thou on thy face?"⁴

He wants obedience—the obedience of faith. Depend upon it, we shall not miss the blessing if we humbly and believingly betake ourselves to the appointed channels.

But there is yet another Hindrance to the Present Operation, in all the fulness of His Power, of the Holy Ghost—the *divided condition of the Church in Scotland*, the schisms wherewith, amongst us, the Body Mystical of the Lord Jesus is rent and torn.

"And do we marvel," cried Bishop Andrewes, at a time when schism was but beginning in the Reformed

¹ *Shorter Catechism*, Q. 85.

² 2 Kings v. 1-14.

³ Exodus xiv. 15.

⁴ Joshua vii. 10.

Church of England; "do we marvel that the Spirit doth scarcely pant in us? that we sing and say—'Come, Holy Ghost,' and yet He cometh no faster? Why, the day of Pentecost is come, and we are not all of one accord. Accord is wanting; the very first point is wanting. Verily there is not a greater bar to the Spirit's working than discord and disunited hearts. . . . Sure His after coming shall be like His first, when this evil is taken from among us, and once more we may keep a true and perfect Pentecost like that first one, where they were all *of one accord*."¹

Our Society, which has witnessed these ten years past in the Church of Scotland to "the Ancient Faith" of the Holy Ghost, and the pressing need there is for maintaining and proclaiming it; which has witnessed, amid continual obloquy, to the "Efficacy of the Sacraments," and the "Necessity of a valid Ordination to the Holy Ministry," lifts up also its witness and its prayers to-day, as on the day when it was founded, for the "Furtherance of Catholic Unity," and, more particularly, for the Union of the Churches of Great Britain.

We appeal to all our brethren in the Lord to "lay to heart the great danger that they, and we, are in by our unhappy divisions."² We appeal to them to realise what a sign these divisions are "that we are carnal and walk as men":³ how grievous they must be to Him who is the Spirit of Unity. We appeal to those who see, as we do, the need of a Revival of Religion in our land, and who own, as we do, the

¹ *Sermons*, iii. p. 113, Oxford edition.

² *Book of Common Prayer*—Accession Service.

³ 1 Cor. iii. 3.

Holy Ghost as the Lord and Life-Giver. We ask them to join us in trying to deepen in all our Churches "a penitential sense of the sin and peril of Schism,"¹ and in working with us (wherever loyalty to the truth we know may open for us the way) for the removal of this great Hindrance, of Disunion, to the manifestation, as in ancient days, of the Spirit's quickening, sanctifying, beautifying might.

¹ See the *Constitution of the Scottish Church Society* reprinted at the end of this work.

APPENDIX.

The Scottish Church Society.

CONSTITUTION.

I. The name of the Society shall be "THE SCOTTISH CHURCH SOCIETY."

II. The Motto of the Society shall be: "*Ask for the Old Paths . . . and walk therein.*"

III. The general purpose of the Society shall be to defend and advance Catholic doctrine as set forth in the Ancient Creeds, and embodied in the Standards of the Church of Scotland; and generally to assert Scriptural principles in all matters relating to Church Order and Policy, Christian Work, and Spiritual Life, throughout Scotland.

IV. Among the special objects to be aimed at shall be the following:

1. The consistent affirmation of the Divine basis, supernatural life, and heavenly calling of the Church.
2. The fostering of a due sense of the historic continuity of the Church from the first.
3. The maintaining of the necessity of a valid Ordination to the Holy Ministry, and the celebration in a befitting manner of the rite of Ordination.

4. The assertion of the efficacy of the Sacraments.
5. The promotion of the religious education and pastoral care of the young, on the basis of Holy Baptism.
6. The restoration of the Holy Communion to its right place in relation to the worship of the Church, and to the spiritual life of the baptised.
7. The revival of Daily Service wherever practicable.
8. The observance in its main features of the Christian year.
9. The encouragement, where practicable, of free and open churches.
10. The advancement of a higher spiritual life among the clergy.
11. The restoration of more careful pastoral discipline of clergy and laity.
12. The deepening in the laity of a due sense of their priesthood, and the encouraging them to fulfil their calling in the worship and work of the Church.
13. The promotion of right methods for the pastoral training of candidates for the Holy Ministry.
14. The promotion of Evangelistic work on Church lines.
15. The placing on a right basis of the financial support of the Church through systematic giving, and the restoration of the Weekly Offering to its proper place in thought and worship.
16. The better fulfilment by the Church of her duties in regard to Education ; and to the care of the poor.
17. The consideration of Social Problems with a view to their adjustment on a basis of Christian justice and brotherhood.
18. The maintenance of the law of the Church in regard to Marriage.
19. The maintenance of the Scriptural view (as held by the Reformers and early Assemblies) as to the heinousness of the sin of sacrilege.

20. The reverent care and seemly ordering of churches and churchyards ; and the preservation of ancient ecclesiastical monuments.
21. The deepening of a penitential sense of the sin and peril of schism.
22. The furtherance of Catholic unity in every way consistent with true loyalty to the Church of Scotland.

V. Among the Methods to be adopted for the promotion of these objects shall be :

1. Private and united Prayer.
2. Meetings for Conference as circumstances require.
3. A public Church Society Conference or Congress to be held annually in one of the larger towns in Scotland ; a full Report of the Proceedings of each Congress to be afterwards published and circulated.
4. The preparation and publication from time to time of such Occasional Papers, Forms of Service, Sermons, Class-books, Parochial or other Leaflets, and Devotional Literature as shall be approved by the Society.
5. The delivery of special Sermons or Lectures in connection with the Society.
6. The provision of aids to the spiritual life of the clergy.
7. The organisation of Parochial Missions.

VI. That the Membership of the Society shall be open to such persons, whether of the clergy or laity, as are in general sympathy with the above objects ; and that admission, after the final adjustment of the Constitution, shall be at an Annual Meeting by the majority of the votes of those present. Women may be admitted as Associates.

VII. That the Office-bearers of the Society shall be a President, Vice-Presidents, Secretary, and Treasurer.

VIII. That in order to the effective and prudent furtherance of the objects of the Society, a **Council** shall be elected, consisting of Members, inclusive of the above Office-bearers, whose duty it shall be to consult together on all matters relating to the said objects, as circumstances may require; to prepare such business as may fall to be submitted to the consideration of the Society; to give advice when it is called for, in cases of difficulty; and to convene special Meetings of the Society when considered expedient by the Council, or when requested so to do by at least Members of the Society. The President, Vice-Presidents, and Secretary of the Society shall also act in these capacities for the Council.

IX. That there shall be an **Editorial Committee**, consisting of Members, whose duty it shall be to consider and prepare all publications to be issued in the name of the Society. This Committee shall elect its own Convener and Secretary.

X. That there shall be a **Business Committee**, consisting of Members (including the Treasurer of the Society), whose duty it shall be to manage the finances of the Society, and to organise (in conjunction, as may be expedient, with local Committees) all arrangements as to the Conference or Congress and other Meetings of the Society. This Committee shall appoint a Convener and Secretary.

XI. Office-bearers shall be eligible for re-election, except the President, who shall hold office only for one year continuously.

XII. The Committees shall be elected annually at a Meeting to be held in the month of May.

XIII. In the Committees, voting shall be *per capita*, the Chairman having both a casting and deliberative vote.

XIV. The *minimum* Annual Payment of Members and Associates shall be 5s., payable on or before the 31st of January. A single payment of £2 shall confer Life Membership.

XV. The Rules of the Society and the names of Members shall be printed, and a copy given annually to each Member.

XVI. No change shall be made on the Constitution of the Society, except at the Annual Meeting in May. A month's notice of the proposed change must be given in writing to the Secretary ; and the alteration must be carried by a majority of two-thirds of the Members present.

Members of the Church in sympathy with the above objects, and desirous of joining the Society, should communicate with any of the Members, or with the Secretary, Rev. Dr. Cooper, 8 The College, Glasgow.

128 spirit mediated by Christ, 19, 44, 93

129 spirit of love and union - 47

Christ + world - 95 f. 105 f.

unbelief in the Spirit - 232

